arXiv:math/9804009v1 [math.CV] 2 Apr 1998

One example in concern with extension and separate analyticity properties of meromorphic mappings

S. Ivashkovich

March 1994

Abstract

We construct a compact complex manifold of dimension three, such that every meromorphic map from two-dimensional domain into this manifold extends meromorphically onto the envelope of holomorphy of this domain, but there is a meromorphic map of punctured three-dimensional ball into our manifold, which doesn't extend to origin. A Theorem describing the obstructions occuring here is given.

0. Introduction.

The purpose of this paper is to present an example of compact complex three-fold having "strange" behavior with respect to a meromorphic mappings into it and give certain positive results in entitled direction.

All complex spaces, which we consider in this paper are supposed to be reduced and normal.

Let D and X be complex spaces. Recall that a meromorphic mapping f from D to X is defined by its graph Γ_f, which is an analytic subset of the product $D\times X$, satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $\Gamma_{\rm f}$ is locally irreducible analytic subset of $D\times X$.

(ii) The restriction $\pi\mid_{\Gamma_f}\colon \Gamma_f\longrightarrow D$ of the natural projection $\pi : D\times X\longrightarrow D$ to Γ_f is proper, surjective and generically one to one.

This notion of meromorphicity is due to Remmert, see [Re], and is based on the observation that meromorphic functions on D are precisely the meromorphic mappings, in the sense just defined into $X=\mathbb{CP}^1$. Denote by

$$H^n(r)=\{(z_1,...z_n)\in C^n : \|z'\|<r, |z_n|<1 \text{ or } \|z'\|<1, 1-r<|z_n|<1\} \tag{0.1}$$

a n-dimensional Hartogs figure. Here $z'=(z_1,...,z_{n-1})$, $0<r<1$ and $\|\cdot\|$ stands for the polydisk norm in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Definition. *Recall, that the complex space X possesses a meromorphic (holomorphic) extension property in dimension n if any meromorphic (holomorphic) mapping $f : H^n(r)\to X$ extends meromorphically (holomorphically) onto the unit polydisk Δ^n.*

When one studies an extension properties of holomorphis mappings one finds the following statements, proved correspondingly in [Sh-1] and [Iv-1], usefull:

AMS subject classification: 32 D 15, Key words: meromorphic map, Hartogs extension theorem, Lelong number, separate meromorphicity, Rothstein-type extension theorem.

1. If a complex space X posseds a holomorphic extension property in dimension n then for every domain D over a Stein manifold Ω of dimension n any holomorphic mapping $f : D \to X$ extends to a holomorphic mapping $\hat{f} : \hat{D} \to X$ from the envelope of holomorphy $\hat{D}$ of D into X.
2. If a complex space X posseds a holomopric extension property in dimension 2 then X posseds a hol.ext.prop. in all dimensions $n \geq 2$.

The same proof as was given by B. Shiffman in [Sh-1] shows that the first statement remains valid for the meromrophic mappings. While, and this is our starting point here, the second fails to be true!

Namely in §1 we shall construct the following

Example . *There exists a compact complex three-fold X such that:*

(a) For every domain D in $\mathbb{C}^2$ every meromorphic mapping $f : D \longrightarrow X$ extends to a meromorphic mapping $\hat{f} : \hat{D} \longrightarrow X$. Here $\hat{D}$ stands for the envelope of holomorphy of D.

(b) But there exists a meromorphic mapping $F : \mathbb{B}^3 \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow X$ from punctured three-ball into X which does not extend to the origin.

This example shows the essential difference between extension properties of holomorphic and meromorphic mappings. In fact this phenomena backwards several difficulties in studying the meromorphic maps. Thats why we devote the "positive" part of this paper to the explainations what are the obstructions for passing from extension of mappings of two-dimensional domains to three-dimensional ones. We shall prove in this direction the following

Theorem. *Let $f : H^3(r) \longrightarrow X$ be a meromorphic mapping of 3-dimensional Hartogs figure into a complex space X, which possesses a meromorphic extension property in dimension two. Then:*

(i) f extends to a meromorphic mapping of $\Delta^3 \setminus S$, where S has a form $S = S_1 \times S_2 \times S_3$, and S_j are closed subsets in Δ of harmonic measure zero.

(ii) Let $s_0 \in S$ be a point. Suppose that the Lelong numbers $\Theta(f^* w_h, s_0)$ and $\Theta((f^* w_h)^2, s_0)$ are finite. Then there exists a regular modification $\pi : \hat{\Delta}^3 \longrightarrow \Delta^3$, such that $f \circ \pi$ holomorphically extends onto some neighborhood of $\pi^{-1}(s_0)$.

Remark. In this theorem we suppose that the space X is equipped with some Hermitian metric h, and w_h its associated (1,1)-form. Currents $T_k = (f^* w)^k$ are defined on $\Delta^3 \setminus S$. We define the Lelong numbers of (k,k)-current R in s_0 as

$$\Theta(R, s_0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \sup 1/\varepsilon^{2(n-k)} \int_{B_{s_0}(\varepsilon) \setminus S} R \wedge (dd^c \|z\|^2)^{2(n-k)}. \tag{0.2}$$

$\Theta(R, s_0)$ can take also infinite values. Remark only that finiteness or infiniteness of those numbers in s_0 doesn't depend on the particular choice of metric h on X.

We want to point out here the following. If one wishes to use the Bishops extension theorem for analytic sets in order to extend the graph Γ_f from $(\Delta^3 \setminus S) \times X$ onto $\Delta^3 \times X$, one

needs to estimate the volume of Γ_f in the neighbourhood of S, say in the neighbourhood of some point $s_0 \in S$. For this one needs to estimate besides

$$\int_{B_{s_0}(\varepsilon)} f^*w \wedge (dd^c\|z\|^2)^2 \text{ and } \int_{B_{s_0}(\varepsilon)} (f^*w)^2 \wedge dd^c\|z\|^2$$

also the integral $\int_{B_{s_0}(\varepsilon)}(f^*w)^3$. The theorem stated above makes possible for us to get rid of the last integral.

Of course the finitness of Lelong numbers of the current f^*w_h and its powers are nessessary for the extension of f. Finally, holomorphic extension of $f \circ \pi$ to the neighborhood of $\pi^{-1}(s_0)$ implies a meromorphic extension of f to the neighborhood of s_0.

Methods which are developped here we apply to the questions of separate analyticity of meromrophic mappings with values in general complex spaces, see 2.5 for details.

I would also like to give my thanks to the referee for numerous remarks and corrections.

Table of content.

0. Introduction. . . . . . *pp. 1-3*

1. Counterexample. . . . . . *pp. 3 - 9*
1.1. Construction of an Example . 1.2. Construction of the universal cover and nonextendable map. 1.3. Two-dimensional extension property of X.

2. Meromorphic polydisks. . . . . . *pp. 9 - 20*
2.1. Generalities on pluripotential theory. 2.2. Passing to higher dimensions: holomorphic case. 2.3. Sequences of analytic sets of bounded volume. 2.4. Families of meromorphic polydisks. 2.5. Application: Rothstein-type theorem and separate meromorphicity.

3. Estimates of Lelong numbers from below. . . . . . *pp. 20 - 29*
3.1. Generalities on blowings-up. 3.2. Estimates. 3.3. Proof of the Theorem.

4. References. . . . . . *pp. 29 - 31*

1. Counterexample.

We shall start with the construction of the example announced in the Introduction.

1.1. Construction of an example.

Take $\mathbb{C}^3$ with coordinates z_1, z_2, z_3. Denote by l_0 the line $\{z_3 = z_2 = 0\}$. l_0 has a natural coordinate z_1. By X_0 denote the ball of radii $1/2$ centered at zero in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

Consider now a blowing up $\hat{\mathbb{C}}^3$ of C^3 along l_0. The origin in $\mathbb{C}^3$ we denote by 0_0. Let $\pi_0 : \hat{\mathbb{C}}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ be our modification, $E_0 = \pi_0^{-1}(l_0)$ – the exceptional divisor. By 0_1 we denote the point of intersection of the strict transform $\pi_0^{-1}([z_3])$ of z_3 - axis with E_0. In the affine neighborhood of 0_1 we introduce the standard coordinate system u_1, u_2, u_3 such that modification $\pi_0 : \hat{\mathbb{C}}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ in those coordinates is given by

$$z_1 = u_1$$
$$z_2 = u_2 u_3 \tag{1.1.1}$$
$$z_3 = u_3$$

The preimage of 0_0 under the modification π_0 we denote by $l_1^{'}$. Put $\pi_0^{-1}(X_0) = X_1$. Now we blow up X_1 along $l_1^{'}$. Denote by $\pi_1 : X_2 \longrightarrow X_1$ this modification. Let E_1 be the exceptional divisor of π_1 and l_1 let be the intersection of E_1 and E_0 (more precisely with the strict transform of E_0 under π_1) . The proper preimage of 0_1 under π_1 we denote by $l_2^{'}$. The point of intersection of $l_2^{'}$ with E_0 denote by 0_2. In the affine neighborhood of 0_2 we introduce coordinate system v_1, v_2, v_3 (standard one for the modification π_1) in which our modification π_1 is given by

$$u_1 = v_1$$
$$u_2 = v_2 \tag{1.1.2}$$
$$u_3 = v_1 v_3$$

Next, consider the blowing up of X_2 along $l_2^{'}$ $\pi_2 : X_3 \longrightarrow X_2$. By E_2 denote the exceptional divisor of π_2. Put $l_2 = E_2 \cap E_1, l_3^{'} = E_2 \cap E_0$. 0_3 let be the point of intersection $E_0 \cap E_1 \cap E_2$. Here again by E_0, E_1 we understand the appropriate strict transforms. We introduce a coordinates w_1, w_2, w_3 in affine neighborhood of 0_3 in such a way that $\pi_2 : X_3 \longrightarrow X_2$ is given in those coordinates by

$$v_1 = w_1 w_2$$
$$v_2 = w_2 \tag{1.1.3}$$
$$v_3 = w_3$$

Take now the composition $\pi = \pi_0 \circ \pi_1 \circ \pi_2 : X_3 \longrightarrow X_0$,which in coordinates can be written as

$$z_1 = w_1 w_2$$
$$z_2 = w_1 w_2^2 w_3 \tag{1.1.4}$$
$$z_3 = w_1 w_2 w_3$$

Take now two copies of X_0, denote them by $X_0^{(1)}$ and $X_0^{(2)}$. On $X_0^{(i)}$ let us fix initial coordinates $z_1^{(i)}, z_2^{(i)}, z_3^{(i)}$. On the affine neighborhood of $0_3^{(i)} \in X_3^{(i)}$ we fix coordinates $w_1^{(i)}, w_2^{(i)}, w_3^{(i)}$ so as where introduced by $(1.1.1), (1.1.2), (1.1.3)$. Consider now a holomorphic mapping $\phi : X_0^{(1)} \longrightarrow X_3^{(2)}$, which sends zero $0_0^{(1)}$ from $X_0^{(1)}$ to $0_3^{(2)}$ and in coordinates $z^{(1)}$ and $w^{(2)}$ is defined by

$$w_1^{(2)} = z_1^{(1)}$$

$$w_2^{(2)} = z_2^{(1)} \qquad (1.1.5)$$
$$w_3^{(2)} = z_3^{(1)}$$

i.e. ϕ is identity in $z^{(1)}, w^{(2)}$.

Now blow up $l_0^{(1)}$ in $X_0^{(1)}$ and $l_3^{(2)'}$ in $X_3^{(2)}$. Denote the manifolds obtained by $\hat{X}_0^{(1)}$ and $\hat{X}_3^{(2)}$. $\hat{X}_0^{(1)} = X_1^{(1)}$ in our notations. Proper preimage of $l_3^{(2)'}$ denote by E_3. Lift up ϕ to a biholomorphism $\hat{\phi} : \hat{X}_0^{(1)} \longrightarrow \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0^{(1)}) \subset \hat{X}_3^{(2)}$. The fact that ϕ lifts to a biholomorphism, not just a bimeromorphism, of blowings up follows from the observation that $l_3^{(2)'}$ in coordinates $w^{(2)}$ is given by $\{w_2^{(2)} = w_3^{(2)} = 0\}$. Recall, that $l_0^{(1)}$ is given by $\{z_2^{(1)} = z_3^{(1)} = 0\}$. So from (1.1.5) we see that ϕ sends the center of blown up $l_0^{(1)}$ into another one $l_3^{(2)'}$, and thus the lifting $\hat{\phi}$ is holomorphic.

Now take small $\varepsilon > 0$. By $X_0^{\pm\varepsilon}$ denote the ball in $\mathbb{C}^3$ of radii $\frac{1}{2} \pm \varepsilon$. By $X_j^{\pm\varepsilon}, j = 1,2,3$ denote manifolds obtained by our blowings up from $X_0^{\pm\varepsilon}$ as X_j from X_0. By $X_j^{(i)^{\pm\varepsilon}}$ denote the corresponding manifolds obtained from $X_0^{(i)}$, i = 1,2.

Take $U^\varepsilon = \hat{X}_3^{(2)^\varepsilon} \setminus \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0^{(1)^{-\varepsilon}})$ - domain in $\hat{X}_3^{(2)^\varepsilon}$. Here $(2)^\varepsilon$ and $(1)^{-\varepsilon}$ one should understand as indices, not as numbers. By $\pi_0^{(1)} : \hat{X}_0^{(1)} \longrightarrow X_0^{(1)}$, $\pi_i^{(2)} : X_{i+1}^{(2)} \longrightarrow X_i^{(2)}, i = 0,1,2, \pi^{(2)} = \pi_0^{(2)} \circ \pi_1^{(2)} \circ \pi_2^{(2)}$ we denote the corresponding modifications.

Consider a map $\psi : X_0^{(2)^\varepsilon} \longrightarrow X_0^{(1)^\varepsilon}$ which in our coordinates $z^{(i)}$ is given as identity:

$$z_1^{(1)} = z_1^{(2)}$$
$$z_2^{(1)} = z_2^{(2)} \qquad (1.1.6)$$
$$z_3^{(1)} = z_3^{(3)}$$

Lift this map onto the blowings up to get

$$\hat{\psi} : \hat{X}_0^{(2)^\varepsilon} \longrightarrow \hat{X}_0^{(1)^\varepsilon} \qquad (1.1.7)$$

Now remark that further blowings up of $\hat{X}_0^{(2)^\varepsilon} = X_1^{(2)^\varepsilon}$ do not effect the neighborhoods of the boundaries of $\hat{X}_0^{(i)}$. We shall denote this neighborhoods as $V^{(i)^\varepsilon}$, having in mind that they are copies in $\hat{X}_0^{(i)^\varepsilon}$ of $V^\varepsilon = \hat{X}_0^\varepsilon \setminus cl(\hat{X}_0^{-\varepsilon})$. So biholomorphism $\hat{\psi}$, defined in (1.1.7),can be restricted to a biholomorphism (which we denote by the same letter) $\hat{\psi} : V^{(2)^\varepsilon} \longrightarrow V^{(1)^\varepsilon}$. Now we can define a biholomorphism $g = \hat{\phi} \circ \hat{\psi}$ between $V^{(2)^\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{\phi}(V^{(1)^\varepsilon})$ - neighborhoods of two connected components of the boundary of $U^{(2)}$ in $U^{(2)^\varepsilon}$. Here we defined $U^{(i)}$ and $U^{(i)^\varepsilon}$ to be a copies in $X_3^{(i)^\varepsilon}$, of the open sets $U = \hat{X}_3^{(2)} \setminus \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0^{(1)})$ and $U^\varepsilon = \hat{X}_3^{(2)^\varepsilon} \setminus \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0^{(1)^{-\varepsilon}})$.

Now we can glue the neighborhoods $V^{(2)^\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{\phi}(V^{(1)^\varepsilon})$ by biholomorphism g to get from $U^{(2)^\varepsilon}$ a compact complex threefold X.

Note that after gluing E_0 and E_3 constitute one divisor. We shall denote it both as E_0 or E_3.

1.2. Construction of the universal cover and nonextendable map.

We must prove two facts about X. First: that there exists a meromorphic mapping $F : B^3 \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow X$ which does not extend to the origin. Second: any meromorphic map $f : H^2(r) \longrightarrow X$ extends to a meromorphic map $\hat{f} : \Delta^2 \longrightarrow X$. Here $H^2(r) = \{(u_1, u_2) \in \Delta^2 : |u_1| < r \text{ or } 1 - r < |u_2| < 1\}$ is a Hartogs figure of dimension two. To prove this we shall need the universal covering $\widetilde{X}$ of X. In this paragraph we give the construction of $\widetilde{X}$ together with nonextendable mapping $F : B^3 \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow X$.

We shall make this construction in 5 steps.

In the previous paragraph we had constructed a biholomorphic mapping $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow \hat{\phi}(V^\varepsilon)$, where both V^ε and $\hat{\phi}(V^\varepsilon)$ are open subsets of $\hat{X}_3^\varepsilon$, and actually are the neighborhoods of the connected components of the boundary of $U = \hat{X}_3 \setminus \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0)$. To simplify a bit our notations we denote the subset $\hat{\phi}(V^\varepsilon)$ of $\hat{X}_3^\varepsilon$ simply as V_0^ε.

Step 1. Construction of manifolds $X^{(i)}$ and $U_i^\varepsilon, i \geq 0$.

Put $X^{(0)} = \hat{X}_3^\varepsilon$. Domain U^ε in $X^{(0)}$ denote as U_0^ε. Attach $X^{(0)}$ to U^ε by $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow V_0^\varepsilon \subset U^\varepsilon$. Manifold obtained, denote as $X^{(1)}$.

Manifold $X^{(1)}$ has exactly one end, namely V^ε. Domain in $X^{(1)}$ which is $U^\varepsilon \sqcup U_0^\varepsilon / g$ we denote by U_1^ε.

We can repeat this construction with $X^{(1)}$ instead of $X^{(0)}$. Namely, take $X^{(1)}$ and attach it to U^ε by $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow V_0^\varepsilon \subset U^\varepsilon$ to get $X^{(2)}$. Domain in $X^{(2)}$ which is $U_1^\varepsilon \sqcup U^\varepsilon / g$ we denote by U_2^ε.

Suppose that the manifold $X^{(i)}$ is constructed and it has one end V^ε. Attach $X^{(i)}$ to U^ε by $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow U^\varepsilon$ to get $X^{(i+1)}$, which again has one end V^ε. Domain in $X^{(i+1)}$ which is $U_i^\varepsilon \sqcup U^\varepsilon / g$ denote by U_{i+1}^ε .

Step 2. Construction of manifolds $X^{(-i)}$ and $U_{-i}^\varepsilon, i \geq 0$.

As $X^{(0)}$ we take again $\hat{X}_3^\varepsilon$ with $U_0^\varepsilon = U^\varepsilon$.

To obtain $X^{(-1)}$ attach $\hat{X}_3^\varepsilon$ to U_0^ε by $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow V_0^\varepsilon \subset U_0^\varepsilon$. Domain in $X^{(-1)}$ which is $U_0^\varepsilon \sqcup U^\varepsilon / g$ denote by U_{-1}^ε.

Suppose that the manifold $X^{(-i)}$ and domain U_{-i} in $X^{(-i)}$ are constructed. To get $X^{(-i-1)}$ attach $\hat{X}_3^\varepsilon$ to U_{-i}^ε by $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow V_0^\varepsilon \subset U_{-i}^\varepsilon$ and put $U_{-i-1}^\varepsilon = U_{-i}^\varepsilon \sqcup U^\varepsilon / g$.

Step 3. Construction of the universal cover.

Manifolds U_i^ε and U_{-i}^ε have the common part U_0^ε. So we can glue them by the identification in $U_i^\varepsilon \sqcup U_{-i}^\varepsilon$ of two copies of U_0^ε. The manifold obtained we denote by $U_{-i,i}^\varepsilon$. In the same way we can consider $U_i^\varepsilon \sqcup U_{-j}^\varepsilon / g = U_{i,-j}^\varepsilon$.

We have now an increasing sequence of complex manifolds $U_0^\varepsilon \subset\subset U_{1,-1}^\varepsilon \subset\subset ..... \subset\subset U_{i,-i}^\varepsilon \subset\subset \cdots$. The union $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} U_{i,-i}^\varepsilon = U_\infty$ is a complex manifold, and we are going to prove that it is the universal cover of X. We first remark, that obviously U_∞ is simply connected.

Step 4. Construction of group of covering transformations.

We start with the biholomorphic mapping $g : V^\varepsilon \longrightarrow V_0^\varepsilon$ which sends one end of U_0^ε to another. Recall that $U_0^\varepsilon / g \cong X$ is our compact threefold.

Lemma 1.2.1 g extends to biholomorphic automorphism of U_∞. Moreover we have $X \cong U_\infty / < g^n >_{n \in Z}$.

Proof. The heuristic argument for the extendability of g is that it is given "as identity" in globally defined coordinates. But we shall use here the Hartogs-type extension argument. After this the second statement of the lemma becomes clear.

For any pair of integers (i,j) such that $i > j$ we consider a subdomain $U^{\varepsilon}_{i,j}$ in U_∞ defined in a following way.

If $i \geq 0 \geq j$ then $U^{\varepsilon}_{i,j}$ is already defined.

If $0 \geq i > j$ then $U^{\varepsilon}_{i,j} = U^{\varepsilon}_{j} \setminus U^{\varepsilon -}_{i}$.

If $i > j \geq 0$ then $U^{\varepsilon}_{i,j} = U^{\varepsilon}_{i} \setminus U^{-\varepsilon}_{j}$.

Here domains $U^{\varepsilon -}_{i}$ are constructed from $U^{\varepsilon -} = \hat{X}_3^{(2)^{\varepsilon}} \setminus \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0^{(1)^{\varepsilon}})$ in a similar way as U^{ε}_{i} from U^{ε}, and $U^{-\varepsilon}_{j}$ form $U^{-\varepsilon} = \hat{X}_3^{(2)^{-\varepsilon}} \setminus \hat{\phi}(\hat{X}_0^{(1)^{-\varepsilon}})$.

By attaching X^{ε}_3 to $U^{\varepsilon}_{i,j}$ by g we get manifolds $X^{(i,j)}$, $\infty \geq i > j \geq -\infty$.

Our map $g : V^{\varepsilon} \longrightarrow V^{\varepsilon}_0$ we consider as a map from the open subset of $U^{\varepsilon}_{0,-\infty}$ into itself. Note that the image of g is contained in $U^{\varepsilon}_{-1,-\infty}$. We are going to prove that g extends to a biholomorphic map from $U^{\varepsilon}_{0,-\infty}$ onto $U^{\varepsilon}_{-1,-\infty}$.

For this purpose take any $j < 0$. Remark that g maps the neighborhood V^{ε} of the boundary of $X^{(0,j)}$ biholomorphically onto the neighborhood V^{ε}_0 of the boundary of $X^{(-1,j-1)}$. Note that $X^{(0,j)}$ and $X^{(-1,j-1)}$ could be naturally blown down to get an X_0 - the usual ball in $\mathbb{C}^3$. So g became a biholomorphism of the neighborhood of S^5 onto itself. So it extends by the Hartogs extension theorem.

In the same way g^{-1} extends to a biholomorphic map of $U^{\varepsilon}_{\infty,-1}$ onto $U^{\varepsilon}_{\infty,0}$.

q.e.d.

By $p : U_\infty \longrightarrow X$ we denote the covering map.

Step 5. Construction of nonextendable map.

Our construction gives a natural bimeromorphic map $\widetilde{f}$ from $X^{\varepsilon}_0 \setminus \{0\} \cong \mathbb{B}^3_*$ onto $U^{\varepsilon}_{0,-\infty}$. Then taking the composition $p \circ \widetilde{f} = F$ we get our nonextendable map.

Another way to obtain $\widetilde{f}$ is to consider the composition $i \circ \pi^{-1}$ of inclusion $i : V^{\varepsilon} \longrightarrow U^{\varepsilon}_{0,\infty}$ with the restriction of blowing up π^{-1} onto $X^{\varepsilon}_0 \setminus cl(X_0^{-\varepsilon})$. Now, similarly to the step 4, one can easily observe that $i \circ \pi^{-1}$ extends to a bimeromorphic map $\widetilde{f} : X^{\varepsilon}_0 \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow U^{\varepsilon}_{0,-\infty}$.

1.3. Two - dimensional extension property of X.

In this paragraph we shall prove that every meromorphic map $f : H^2(r) \longrightarrow X$ extends to a meromorphic map $\hat{f} : \Delta^2 \longrightarrow X$.

Take $0 < \delta < r$ and denote by $H_\delta(r) = \{(u_1,u_2) \in \Delta^2 : |u_1| < r - \delta, |u_2| < 1 - \delta$ or $|u_1| < 1 - \delta, 1 - r + \delta < |u_2| < 1 - \delta\}$ - shrunked Hartogs domain. It is sufficient to prove the extendability of f onto $\Delta^2_{1-\delta} = \{(u_1,u_2) \in C^2 : |u_j| < 1 - \delta, j = 1,2\}$ for arbitrary $\delta > 0$.

Using the fact that $H^2(r)$ is simply connected we can lift f to a meromorphic map $\widetilde{f} : H^2(r) \longrightarrow U_\infty$. $H_\delta(r) \subset\subset H^2(r)$ so $\widetilde{f}(H_\delta(r)) \subset\subset U_\infty$, the latter means that there exists $i < \infty$ such that $\widetilde{f}(H_\delta\})(r)) \subset U^{\varepsilon}_{i,-i}$. Applying g^i to $\widetilde{f}$ we get a map $f_1 = g^i \circ \widetilde{f} : H_\delta(r) \longrightarrow U^{\varepsilon}_{0,-2i}$. If we extend f_1 as a meromorphic map $\hat{f}_1$ from $\Delta^2_{1-\delta}$ to $U^{\varepsilon}_{0,-\infty}$ then $p \circ g^{-i} \circ \hat{f}_1$ will give us a desired extension of f.

Take a composition $h = p \circ f_1 : H_\delta(r) \longrightarrow X_0 \cong B^3_{1/2} \subset \mathbb{C}^3$. This is a holomorphic mapping of $H_\delta(r)$ into $X_0 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$. So it extends to a holomorphic map $\hat{h} : \Delta^2_{1-\delta} \longrightarrow X_0$. By A denote the preimage of zero under $\hat{h}$. There are three possibilities.

Case 1. $A = \Delta^2_{1-\delta}$. That means that $f(H_\delta(r)) \subset E$, where E is an exceptional divisor of X. But all three components of E are bimeromorphic to $\mathbb{CP}^2$. So in that case f obviously extends onto $\Delta^2_{1-\delta}$.

Case 2. A has components of positive dimension.

Denote them by $A_1, ..., A_N$. Let also $a_1, ..., a_M$ are the isolated preimages of zero under $\hat{h}$.

Because $p : U^\varepsilon_{0,-\infty} \setminus \left[\bigcup_{i=1}^{-\infty}\bigcup_{j=0}^{3} E^i_j \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{3} E^0_j\right] \longrightarrow X_0 \setminus \{0\}$ is bimeromorphic we have an extension of f_1 onto $\Delta^2_{1-\delta} \setminus \left[\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} A^-_j \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{M}\{a_k\}\right]$. Here we denote by $A^+_j = A_j \cap H_\delta(r)$, by $A^-_j = A_j \setminus A^+_j$,and E^i_j denote the copies of E_j in $U^\varepsilon_{i,i-1}, j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Note that E^i_3 is glued to E^{i-1}_0 and constitute a single divisor, which we shall denote either by E^i_3 or E^{i-1}_0.

Consider now f_1 as a meromorphic map from $H_\delta(r)$ to $U^\varepsilon_{0,-2i} \subset X^{(-2i-L)}$. Because $X^{(-2i-L)}$ is nothing but a blown up ball we can extend f_1 as a map $\hat{f}$ from $\Delta^2_{1-\delta}$ to $X^{(-2i-L)}$. Now $\hat{f}_1(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} A_j) \subset \bigcup_{k=0}^{-2i}\bigcup_{j=0}^{3} E^k_j$, because $f_1(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} A^+_j) \subset \bigcup_{k=0}^{-2i}\bigcup_{j=0}^{3} E^k_j$. That means that $\hat{f}_1(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} A_j)$ do not intersect E_2^{-2i-L} for L big enough. This follows from Lemma 1.3.1 stated below and the fact that nontrivial holomorphic mapping from 1-dimensional space is always locally proper. So its image is locally contained in a curve by the Remmert proper mapping theorem. Before applying Lemma 1.3.1 one only should embed this curve into a (nonsmooth in general) hypersurface. So if we consider f_1 as a map into $U_{0,-\infty}$, then $f_1(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} A_j) \subset U^\varepsilon_{0,-2i-2}$. So there is a neighborhood W of $\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} A_j$ such that $f_1(W) \subset U^\varepsilon_{0,-2i-2}$. The latter means that $p \circ g^{-i} \circ f_1$ extends onto W. So our map f is extended onto $\Delta^2_{1-\delta} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{M}\{a_k\}$.

So the last case left.

Case 3. A is a finite set of points $\{a_1, ..., a_M\}$.

Take a neighborhood B of a_1. Because a_1 is isolated preimage of zero under $\hat{h}$,there is a neighborhood of a_1,say B itself, such that $\hat{h} \mid_{\bar{B}}$ is proper. So $\hat{h}(\bar{B})$ is contained in a germ of hypersurface P in X_0, passing through origin. Note that this fact was not obvious from the beginning because of the well known Osgood example, see [4], p.155. If we shall prove that the lifting $p^{-1}(P)$ of P onto $U_{0,-\infty}$ is relatively compact in $U^\varepsilon_{0,-\infty}$ then we are done, because then f_1 maps $B \setminus \{a_1\}$ into some $U^\varepsilon_{0,-L} \subset X_{1,-L}$.

To prove that the lifting of P by p is relatively compact in $U^\varepsilon_{0,-\infty}$, the next lemma is sufficient. Denote by Φ the transformation given by (1.1.4).

Lemma 1.3.1 *Let $P(z)$ be a convergent series in variables z_1, z_2, z_3. Then ,there exist an N such that $P(\Phi^N(z))$ has the form $z_1^{N_1} \cdot z_2^{N_2} \cdot z_3^{N_3} \cdot \left[a + F(z)\right]$, where a is some nonzero constant, F is convergent series and $F(0) = 0$.*

Proof. Consider a Newton polyhedron N_P of $P(z)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Consider also the next unimod-

ular transformation

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

of $\mathbb{R}^3$. One can easily check the following properties of A :

1. The real eigenvalue μ of A satisfies $\mu > 3$.

2. Consequently the complex one λ satisfies $|\lambda|^2 = 1/\mu < 1/3$.

3. The eigenvector v, which corresponds to μ, has positive coordinates.

4. The A - invariant plane Π, which corresponds to λ intersects the positive octant by zero.

5. Π contains no vectors with integer coordinates.

The latter is true because A acts on Π as rotation together with contraction by λ.

From 5 we see that there is a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that every edge of N_P has an angle at least $\alpha$with Π. Now, because A acts as contraction on Π and as dilatation on $[Rv]$,all edges of N_{P^N} have angles with Π which are uniformly tending to the angle between v and Π. Here by P^N we denoted $P(\underbrace{\Phi \circ ... \circ \Phi}_{N}(z))$.

This proves the lemma.

q.e.d.

Remarks 1. The example, just constructed, has some common futures with an example of Hirschowitz, see [Hs], of weakly but not strongly meromorphic mapping. In fact the map F, obtained in 1.2 is weakly meromorphic in the sense, that for any complex curve $C \ni 0$ the restriction $F\mid_{C\setminus 0}$ extends holomorphically onto C. But clearly the two dimensional extension property of our X is much stronger condition than just a weak meromorphicity of some given map, namely of F, which is not strongly meromorphic.

2. Note also, that X contains some sort of "spherical shell". Namely a *bimeromorphic* image V^ε of the neighborhood of $\mathbb{S}^5$ from $\mathbb{C}^3$ which doesn't bound a domain in X. We want to point out that this is different from the situation examined by M. Kato in [Ka-1], who studied so called "global spherical shells" i.e. *biholomorphic* images of some neighborhoods of S^{2n-1} from $\mathbb{C}^n$, which doesn't bound. Our X doesn't contain a GSS in the sense of Kato.

2. Meromorphic polydisks.

2.1. Generalities on pluripotential theory.

We start with some well known facts from pluripotential theory . Let D be an open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and S subset of D. Consider the next class of functions

$$\mathcal{U}(S, D) = \{u \in \mathcal{P}_-(D) : u|_S \geq 1\} \tag{2.1.1}$$

where by $\mathcal{P}_-(D)$ we denote the class of nonnegative plurisuperharmonic functions in D.

Definition 2.1.1. The lower regularization w_* of the function

$$w(\zeta, S, D) = \inf\{u(\zeta) : u \in \mathcal{U}(S, D)\} \tag{2.1.2},$$

is called a $\mathcal{P}$- measure of S in D, i.e.

$$w_*(z,S,D) = \lim_{\zeta\to z} \inf w(\zeta,S,D) \tag{2.1.3}$$

Note that w_* is plurisuperharmonic in D .

Definition 2.1.2. A point $s_0 \in S$ is called a locally regular point of S if $w_*(s_0, S\cap \Delta(s_0,\varepsilon),\Delta(s_0,\varepsilon)) = 1$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

We shall also say that the set S is locally regular at s_0.

The next statement is known as the two constants theorem; see for ex. [Sa]:

let v be plurisubharmonic in D such that $v|_S \le M_0$ and $v|_D \le M_1$. Then for $z \in D$ one has

$$v \le M_0 \cdot w_*(z) + M_1 \cdot [1 - w_*(z)] \tag{2.1.4).}$$

The following lemma can be proved by Taylor expansion and using (2.1.4).

Lemma 2.1.1. *Suppose that the function f is holomorphic and bounded by modulus with constant M in $\Delta^n \times \Omega$, where Ω is a subdomain in Δ^q. Let for $s \in S$ $f_s = f(s,\cdot)$ extends holomorphically onto $\Delta^q_s = \{s\} \times \Delta^q$. Suppose that all this extensions are also bounded by modulus with M. If $s_0 \in S$ is a locally regular point then for every $0 < b < 1$ there is an $r > 0$ such that f holomorphically extends onto $\Delta^n(s_0,r) \times \Delta^q(b)$ and is bounded by modulus with $M \cdot \frac{1+b}{2}$.*

Recall that a compact subset $S \subset D$ is called pluripolar if there exists a plurisubharmonic function u in $D, u \not\equiv -\infty$, such that $u\ |_S \equiv -\infty$. S is complete pluripolar if $S = \{z : u(z) = -\infty\}$. We shall repeatedly use the following statement:

if subset $S \subset D$ (D is now pseudoconvex) is not locally regular at all its points then S is pluripolar,

see [B-T],[Sa]. We shall use the following immediate corollary from the famous Josefson theorem, see [Kl]:

Let Ω be a pseudoconvex set in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let S_n be a sequence of subsets of Ω such that:

1) S_1 is closed and pluripolar in Ω;

2) $S_{n+1} \subset \Omega \setminus S_n$ is closed in $\Omega \setminus S_n$ pluripolar;

Then $S := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S_n$ is pluripolar in Ω.

2.2. Passing to higher dimensions: holomorphic case.

We want to show now that if a complex space X possesses a *holomorphic* extension property in dimension two than X possesses this property in all higher dimensions. Let $n \ge 3$. Put

$$E^n(r) = (\Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta_r \times \Delta) \cup (\Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta \times A_{1-r,1}) = \Delta_r^{n-2} \times H^2(r)$$

Lemma 2.2.1. *If any meromorphic (holomorphic) map $f : E^n(r) \to X$ extends to a meromorphic (holomorphic) map $\hat{f} : \Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta^2 \to X$ then the space X possesses a meromorphic (holomorphic) extension property in dimension n.*

Proof. Let $f : H^n(r) \to X$ be a meromorphic (holomorphic) map. Because $E^n(r) \subset H^n(r)$ the map f can be extended onto $\Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta^2$. We shall prove by induction on $j = 2, \dots, n$ that f can be extended onto $\Delta_r^{n-j} \times \Delta^j$. For $j = n$ we shall get the statement of *Lemma* .

Suppose it is proved for j. Let $z_1, \dots, z_n$ be the coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n$. For a point $z_0' = (z_0^{n-j+1}, \dots, z_0^{n-1}) \in \Delta_{1-r}^{j-1}$ consider a domain

$$E^n_{z_0'}(r) = [\Delta_r^{n-j-1} \times \Delta_r \times \Delta_r^{j-1}(z_0') \times \Delta] \cup [\Delta_r^{n-j-1} \times \Delta \times \Delta_r^{j-1}(z_0') \times A_{1-r,1}].$$

Here by $\Delta_r^{j-1}(z_0')$ we denote the $(j-1)$-disk of radii r centered at z_0'. Because $E^n_{z_0'} \subset (\Delta_r^{n-j} \times \Delta^j) \cap H^n(r)$ the map f by the induction hypothesis extends onto $\Delta_r^{n-j-1} \times \Delta \times \Delta_r^{j-1}(z_0') \times \Delta$. But

$$\bigcup_{z_0' \in \Delta^{j-1}} \Delta_r^{n-j-1} \times \Delta \times \Delta_{1-r}^{j-1}(z_0') \times \Delta = \Delta_r^{n-j-1} \times \Delta^{j+1}$$

and the *Lemma* is proved.

q.e.d.

Now left to prove the following

Lemma 2.2.2. *Let $f : E^{n+1}(r) \to X$ be a holomorphic mapping into a complex space X. Suppose that for every $z_0^1 \in \Delta_r$ the restriction $f_{z_0^1}$ of f onto $\{z^1 = z_0^1\} \cap E^{n+1}(r) := E^n_{z_0^1}(r)$ extends holomorphically onto $\Delta^n_{z_0^1}(r) := \{z_0^1\} \times \Delta_r^{n-1} \times \Delta^2$. Then f holomorphically extends onto $\Delta_r^{n-1} \times \Delta^2$.*

Proof. Shrinking disks and annuli involved in the definitions of $E^{n+1}(r)$ and $E^n_{z_0^1}(r)$ we can suppose that f is defined in the neighborhood of $\overline{E^{n+1}(r)}$ and for every $z_0^1 \in \bar{\Delta}_r$ extends holomorphically to the neighborhood of $\{z_0^1\} \times \overline{\Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta^2}$ on the hyperplane $\{z^1 = z_0^1\}$, which doesn't depend on z_0^1. Making homothety by $\frac{1}{r}$ on first $(n-1)$ coordinates we can suppose that f is holomorphic in the neighborhood of the closure of domain $(\Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta_r \times \Delta) \cup (\Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta \times A_{1-r,1})$ and for every $z_0^1 \in \bar{\Delta}$ the restriction $f_{z_0^1}$ extends holomorphically to the neighborhood of the closure of $\{z_0^1\} \times \Delta^{n-2} \times \Delta^2$ on the hyperplane $\{z^1 = z_0^1\}$ not depending on z_0^1.

It is enough to prove that for every $z_0^1 \in \bar{\Delta}$ the map f extends holomorphically onto the $(n+1)$-dimensional neighborhood of $\{z_0^1\} \times \bar{\Delta}^n := \bar{\Delta}^n_{z_0^1}$. Because $f_{z_0^1}$ is holomorphic on $\bar{\Delta}^n_{z_0^1}$ the graph $\Gamma_{f_{z_0^1}}$ is an imbedded n-disk in the space $\Delta^{n+1} \times X$. Let W be a Stein neighborhood of $\Gamma_{f_{z_0^1}}$, see [Si-3]. From the holomorphicity of f on $(\Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta_r \times \Delta) \cup (\Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta \times A_{1-r,1})$ follows that for z^1 in some neighborhood $U \ni z_0^1$, $f_{z^1}((\Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta_r \times \Delta) \cup (\Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta \times A_{1-r,1})) \subset W$. But W is Stein, so $f_{z^1}(\bar{\Delta}^{n-2} \times \Delta^2) \subset W$ for all $z_0^1 \in U$. I.e. the map f maps $U \times \bar{\Delta}^{n-2} \times \bar{\Delta}^2$ to W. So the statement of the *Lemma* is reduced to the analogous statement for mappings into Stein manifolds, and for them our *Lemma* is obvious.

q.e.d.

As we already had mentioned in the *Introduction*, our example shows that the analogous statement for *meromorphic* mappings is not valid. Here we only want to point out that the proof of *Lemma 2.2.2* for the *meromorphic* case fails, because if $f_{z_0^1}$ is essentially meromorphic (i.e. not holomorphic) then $\Gamma_{f_{z_0^1}}$ doesn't have Stein neighborhoods.

2.3. Sequences of analytic sets of bounded volume.

A Hermitian metric form on the complex space X we define in the following way. Let an open covering U_α of X is given together with proper holomorphic injections $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \to V_\alpha$ into a domains $V_\alpha \subset \mathbb{C}^{n(\alpha)}$. Let U'_α be the images of U_α. Let $\{w_\alpha\}$ are positive (1,1)-forms on V_α. $\{w_\alpha\}$ defines a Hermitian metric form on X if $(\phi_\alpha \circ \phi_\beta^{-1})^* w_\beta = w_\alpha$ for all α, β. Note that $\phi_\alpha \circ \phi_\beta^{-1}$ is defined in some neighborhood of $\phi_\beta(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta)$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n(\beta)}$. We say that the metric w is Kähler if $dw_\alpha = 0$ on V_α for all α.

Fix a complex space X, equipped with some Hermitian metric h. By w_h, or simply by w denote the $(1,1)$-form canonically associated with h. Let Δ^q be a polydisk in $\mathbb{C}^q$ with standard Euclidean metric e. The associated form will be denoted by $w_e = dd^c\|z\|^2 = i/2\sum_{j=1}^q dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j$. By $p_1 : \Delta^q \times X \longrightarrow \Delta^q$ and $p_2 : \Delta^q \times X \longrightarrow X$ we denote the projections onto the first and second factors. On the product $\Delta \times X$ we consider the metric form $w = p_1^* w_e + p_2^* w_h$.

Definition 2.3.1. By a meromorphic q-disk in the complex space X we shall understand a meromorphic mapping $\phi : \Delta^q \longrightarrow X$, which is defined in some neighbourhood of the closure $\bar{\Delta}^q$.

It will be convenient for us to consider instead of mappings $\phi : \Delta^q \longrightarrow X$ their graphs Γ_ϕ. By $\hat{\phi} = (z, \phi(z))$ we shall denote the mapping into the graph $\Gamma_\phi \subset \Delta^q \times X$. The volume of the graph Γ_ϕ of the mapping ϕ is given by

$$vol(\Gamma_\phi) = \int_{\Gamma_\phi} w^q = \int_{\Delta^q} (\phi^* w_h + dd^c\|z\|^2)^q \tag{2.3.1}$$

Here by $\phi^* w_h$ we denote the preimage of w_h under ϕ, i.e. $\phi^* w_h = (p_1)_* p_2^* w_h$.

Recall that the Hausdorff distance between two subsets A and B of the metric space (Y, ρ) is a number $\rho(A,B) = \inf\{\varepsilon : A^\varepsilon \supset B, B^\varepsilon \supset A\}$. Here by A^ε we denote the ε-neighborhood of the set A, i.e. $A^\varepsilon = \{y \in Y : \rho(y, A) < \varepsilon\}$.

Further, let $\{\phi_r\}$ be the sequence of meromorphic mappings of the complex space D into the complex space X.

Definition 2.3.2. We shall say that $\{\phi_r\}$ converge on the compacts in D to the meromorphic mapping $\phi : D \longrightarrow X$, if for every relatively compact open $D_1 \subset\subset D$ the graphs $\Gamma_{\phi_r} \cap (D_1 \times X)$ converge in the Hausdorff metric on $D_1 \times X$ to the graph $\Gamma_\phi \cap (D_1 \times X)$.

First we shall prove the following

Lemma 2.3.1. *Let $\{\phi_r\}$ be a sequence of meromorphic q-disks in complex space X. Suppose that there exists a compact $K \subset X$ and a constant $C < \infty$ such that:*

a) $\phi_r(\Delta^q) \subset K$ for all r;

b) $vol(\Gamma_{\phi_r}) \leq C$ for all r.

Then there exists a subsequence $\{\phi_{r_j}\}$ and a proper analytic set $A \subset \Delta^q$ such that:

1) the sequence $\{\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}}\}$ *converges in the Hausdorff metric to the analytic subset* Γ *of* $\Delta^q \times X$ *of pure dimension* q*;*

2) $\Gamma = \Gamma_\phi \cup \hat{\Gamma}$*,where* Γ_ϕ *is the graph of some meromorphic mapping* $\phi : \Delta^q \longrightarrow X$*,and* $\hat{\Gamma}$ *is a pure* q*-dimensional analytic subset of* $\Delta^q \times X$ *,mapped by the projection* p_1 *onto* A*;*

3) $\phi_{r_j} \longrightarrow \phi$ *on compacts in* $\Delta^q \setminus A$*;*

4) one has

$$\lim_{j \longrightarrow \infty} vol(\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}}) \geq vol(\Gamma_\phi) + vol(\hat{\Gamma}). \tag{2.3.2}$$

5) For every $1 \leq p \leq dimX - 1$ *there exists a positive constant* $\nu_p = \nu_p(K,h)$ *such that the volume of every pure* p*-dimensional compact analytic subset of* X *which is contained in* K *is not less then* ν_p*.*

6) Put $\hat{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{p=0}^{q-1} \Gamma_p$*, where* Γ_p *is a union of all irreducible components of* $\hat{\Gamma}$ *such that* $dim[p_1(\Gamma_p)] = p$*. Then*

$$vol_{2q}(\hat{\Gamma}) \geq \sum_{p=0}^{q-1} vol_{2p}(A_p) \cdot \nu_{q-p} \tag{2.3.3}$$

where $A_p = p_1(\Gamma_p)$*.*

Proof. 1) The first statement of this lemma is exactly the theorem of Bishop about sequences of analytic sets of bounded volume, see [St]. Because $\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}} \subset \Delta^q \times K$, so also a limit $\Gamma \subset \Delta^q \times K$. Consequently $p_1 \mid_\Gamma : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta^q$ is proper. Further, because $p_1(\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}}) = \Delta^q$ for all so $p_1(\Gamma) = \Delta^q$. That is our map $p_1 \mid_\Gamma : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta^q$ is surjective.

Let $\Gamma \subset \Delta^q \times X$ be an analytic subset and let $p_1 \mid_\Gamma \Gamma :\longrightarrow \Delta^q$ be the restriction of the natural projection onto Γ. We shall say that $p_1 \mid_\Gamma$ is one to one over a generic point, if there exists an open $D \subset \Delta^q$ such that $p_1 \mid_{\Gamma \cap p_1^{-1}(D)} : \Gamma \cap p_1^{-1}(D) \longrightarrow D$ is one to one. In this case, using the Remmert proper mapping theorem one can show that D can be taken to be Δ^q minus proper analytic subset.

2) Define $\Gamma_1 = \{(z,x) \in \Gamma : dim_{(z,x)}(p_1 \mid_\Gamma)^{-1}(z) \geq 1\}$. Γ_1 is an analytic subset of Γ. By the properness of $p_1 \mid_\Gamma$ $A_1 = p_1(\hat{\Gamma}_1)$ is analytic subset of Δ^q. By $\hat{\Gamma}$ denote the union of irreducible components of Γ_1 of dimension q ant put $A = p_1(\Gamma)$. Then $\Gamma = \Gamma_\phi \cup \hat{\Gamma}$, where Γ_ϕ is the union of those irreducible components of Γ which are not in $\hat{\Gamma}$. Remark that because $dimA \leq q-1$ the restriction $p_1 \mid_{\Gamma_\phi}$ is surjective and one to one over the general point. To prove that Γ_ϕ is a graph of some meromorphic mapping it is sufficient to show that Γ_ϕ is irreducible. Suppose that Γ_2 is some nontrivial irreducible component of Γ_ϕ. Because $p_1 \mid_{\Gamma_\phi}$ is one to one over a general point then $p_1(\Gamma_2) = A_2$ is a proper analytic subset of Δ^q. But then $\Gamma_2 \subset \hat{\Gamma}$ by the definition of $\hat{\Gamma}$. So Γ_ϕ is irreducible and thus is a graph of a meromorphic mapping which we denote by ϕ. Let Γ' be the union of all irreducible components of Γ_1 of dimension less then q. Then $p_1(\Gamma') = F$ is exactly the set of points of indeterminacy of the map ϕ.

3) $\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}} \rightarrow \Gamma = \Gamma_\phi \cup \hat{\Gamma}$ on $\Delta^q \times X$. So, because $\hat{\Gamma} = p_1^{-1}(A)$ we have that $\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}} \rightarrow \Gamma_\phi$ on compacts in $(\Delta^q \setminus A) \times X$. By definition this means that $\phi_{r_j} \rightarrow \phi$ on compacts in $\Delta^q \setminus A$.

4) This statement follows from the generalisation of the theorem of Bishop made by Harvey-Shiffman, see [H-S]. The theorem of Harvey-Shiffman states that the sequence of

analytic sets $\{\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}}\}$, which in our case converges to the analytic set Γ in the Hausdorff metric, converges to Γ also in locally flat topology, see Theorem 3.9 from [H-S]. The latter means, in particular, that for any (k,k)- form Ω on $\Delta^q \times X$ with compact support $\int_{\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}}} \Omega \longrightarrow \int_\Gamma \Omega$ when $j \longrightarrow \infty$.

If one takes as Ω the q^{th} exterior power of w times nonnegative function ψ with compact support, i.e. $\Omega = \psi \cdot w^q$, and takes into account that $vol(\Gamma) = \int_\Gamma w^q$, then one gets that for every compact $K \subset \Delta^q \times X$:

$$vol(\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}} \cap K) = \int_{\Gamma_{\phi_{r_j}}} w^q \longrightarrow \int_{\Gamma \cap K} w^q =$$

$$= vol(\Gamma_\phi \cap K) + vol(\hat{\Gamma} \cap K) \tag{2.3.4}$$

Now take into account that K is arbitrary and that the limit in (2.3.4) one should understand with multiplicities. Withought multiplicities one gets from (2.3.4) the stated unequality (2.3.2).

5) Proof of this item we shall derive from contradiction. Suppose that there exists a sequence of pure p-dimensional compact analytic subsets $\{C_j\}$ in X such that $vol(C_j) \longrightarrow 0$ while $j \longrightarrow \infty$. Going to a subsequence one obtaines that $C_{j_k} \longrightarrow C$ in the Haussdorff metrik to the compact p-dimensional analytic set C. From (2.3.2) we see that $vol(C) \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} \inf vol(C_{j_k}) = 0$ which is impossible.

6) The relation (2.3.3) reflects the fact that our metric w on the product is a sum of the metrics on the factors. Recall that $A = p_1(\hat{\Gamma})$, where $\hat{\Gamma}$ is a union of the irreducible components of the limit Γ other then Γ_ϕ. As above denote by $A_p = (p_1|_\Gamma)(\Gamma_p)$, where Γ_p as above is a union of irreducible components of $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that $dim A_p = p$. For the proof of (2.3.3) it is sufficient to show that

$$vol(\Gamma_p) \geq vol(A_p) \cdot \nu_{q-p} \tag{2.3.5}$$

Let us underline that Γ_p is q-dimensional as a union of some q- dimensional components of $\hat{\Gamma}$, and that A_p is p-dimensional. We have

$$vol(\Gamma_p) = \int_{\Gamma_p} w^q = \int_{\Gamma_p} (p_1^* w_e + p_2^* w_h)^q \geq$$

$$\geq \int_{\Gamma_p} (p_1^* w_e)^p \wedge (p_2^* w_h)^{q-p} = \int_{A_p} (\int_{(p_1|_{\hat{\Gamma}})^{-1}(z)} w_h^{q-p}) w_e^p \geq \int_{A_p} \nu_{q-p} \cdot w_e^p =$$

$$= \nu_{q-p} \cdot vol(A_p).$$

In the first unequality we used the fact that all terms of decomposition

$$(p_1^* w_e + p_2^* w_h)^q = \sum_{j=0}^{k} C_j^q (p_1^* w_e)^j \wedge (p_2^* w_h)^{q-j}$$

are positive. In the second one we used that ν_{q-p} is a minima of volumes of $(q-p)$-dimensional compact analytic subsets of X contained in K. q.e.d.

2.4. Meromorphic families of analytic subsets.

Let S be a set, and $W \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^q$ an open subset. W is equipped with the usual Euklidean metric from $\mathbb{C}^q$.

Definition 2.4.1. *By a family of q-dimensional analytic subsets in complex space X we shall understand an subset $\mathcal{F} \subset S \times W \times X$ such that, for every $s \in S$ the set $\mathcal{F}_s = \mathcal{F} \cap \{s\} \times W \times X$ is a graph of a meromorphic mapping of W into X.*

Suppose further that the set S is equipped with topology and let our space X be equipped with some Hermitian metric h.

Definition 2.4.2. *We shall say that the family $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous at point $s_0 \in S$ if $\mathcal{H} - \lim_{s \to s_0} \mathcal{F}_s = \mathcal{F}_{s_0}$.*

Here by $\mathcal{H} - \lim_{s \to s_0} \mathcal{F}_s$ we denote the limit of closed subsets of $\mathcal{F}_s$ in the Hausdorff metric on $W \times X$. $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous if it is continuous at each point of S. If W_0 is open in W then the restriction $\mathcal{F}_{W_0}$ is naturally defined as $\mathcal{F} \cap (S \times W_0 \times X)$.

When S is a complex space itself, we give the following

Definition 2.4.3. *Call the family $\mathcal{F}$ meromorphic if the closure $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ of the set $\mathcal{F}$ is an analytic subset of $S \times W \times X$.*

We shall be interested with an interaction of notions of continuity and meromorphicity of families of meromorphic polydisks.

Let us prove our main statement about meromorphic families. Consider a meromorphic mapping $f : V \times W_0 \longrightarrow X$ into a complex space X, where V is a domain in $\mathbb{C}^p$. Let S be some closed subset of V and $s_0 \in S$ some accumulation point of S. Suppose that for each $s \in S$ the restriction $f_s = f|_{\{s\} \times W_0}$ meromorphically extends onto $W \supset\supset W_0$. We suppose additionally that there is a compact $K \subset\subset X$ such that for all $s \in S$ $f_s(W) \subset K$.

Let, as in Lemma 2.3.1 ν_j denotes the minima of volumes of j-dimensional compact analytic subsets contained in our compact $K \subset X$. Fix some $W_0 \subset\subset W_1 \subset\subset W$ and put

$$\nu = \min\{vol(A_{q-j}) \cdot \nu_j : j = 1, \dots, q\}, \tag{2.4.1}$$

where A_{q-j} are running over all $(q-j)$-dimensional analytic subsets of W, intersecting $\bar{W}_1$. Clearly $\nu > 0$. In the following *Lemma* the volumes of graphs over W are taken. More precisely, having an Euklidean metric form $w_e = dd^c\|z\|^2$ on $W \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ and Hermitian metric form w_h on X, we consider Γ_{f_s} for $s \in S$ as an analytic subsets of $W \times X$ and their volumes are

$$vol(\Gamma_{f_s}) = \int_{\Gamma_{f_s}} (p_1^* w_e + p_2^* w_h)^q = \int_W (w_e + (p_1)_* p_2^* w_h)^q,$$

where $p_1 : W \times X \to W$ and $p_2 : W \times X \to X$ are natural projections.

Lemma 2.4.1. *Suppose that there exists a neighbourhood $U \ni s_0$ in V such that, for all $s_1, s_2 \in S \cap U$*

$$|vol(\Gamma_{f_{s_1}}) - vol(\Gamma_{f_{s_2}})| < \nu/2. \tag{2.4.2}$$

If s_0 is a locally regular point of S then there exists a neighbourhood $V_1 \ni s_0$ in V such, that f meromorphically extends onto $V_1 \times W_1$.

Proof. Step 1. Let s_0 be a locally regular point of S. First of all we remark that the family of analytic subsets $\{\Gamma_{f_s}\}_{s\in S}$ is continuous at s_0 in $W_1 \times X$. Indeed, let $s_n \in S, s_n \to s_0$ as $n \to \infty$. Then from (2.4.2) we see that $vol(\Gamma_{f_{s_n}})$ are uniformly bounded and thus by *Lemma 2.3.1* $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \subset (W_0 \times X)$ extends to a graph of meromorphic mapping over W. This will be also denoted as $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$. Now if one could find a sequence $s_n \in S, s_n \longrightarrow s_0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ such that $\Gamma_{f_{s_n}} \not\longrightarrow \Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$ in Hausdorff metric, then by Lemma 2.3.1, using the boundedness of volumes of Γ_{f_s}, one finds a subsequence, still denoted as s_n such that $\Gamma_{f_{s_n}} \longrightarrow \Gamma \supset \Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$, but not equal $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$.

But then, by the relations (2.3.2) and (2.3.3) of Lemma 2.3.1 one has

$$\lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty} vol(\Gamma_{f_{s_n}}) \geq \nu + vol(\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}),$$

which contradicts (2.4.2) .

Let us prove now that the family $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{s\in S} \Gamma_{f_s} \subset S \times W_0 \times X$ extends to a meromorphic family on $V_1 \times W_1 \times X$ for some neighbourhood $V_1 \ni s_0$.

Fix a point $z_0 \in Reg\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \cap (W_0 \times X)$. Here we consider $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$ as analytic space itself. So $Reg\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$ is connected dense subset in $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$ and $Sing\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} := \Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \setminus Reg\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$ is an analytic subset of $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$.

Now take a point $z_1 \in Reg\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \cap (W \times X)$. Take a path $\gamma : [0,1] \longrightarrow Reg\Gamma_{f_{s_0}}$ from z_0 to z_1. We shall prove that there is a neighborhood Ω of $\gamma([0,1])$ in $W \times X$ and a neighborhood $V \ni s_0$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cap (V \times \Omega)$ extends to an analytic set in $V \times \Omega$.

By T denote the set of those $t \in [0,1]$ that there exists a neighborhoods $\Omega_t \supset \gamma([0,t])$ and $V_t \ni s_0$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cap V_t \times \Omega_t$ extends to an analytic set in $V_t \times \Omega_t$. Note that T is open and contains the origin. Now let t_0 be the cluster point of T. Find the chart $\Sigma \cong \Delta^q \times \Delta^n$ for the space $W \times X$ in the neighborhood of $\gamma(t_0)$ with coordinates $u_1, \ldots, u_q, v_1, \ldots, v_n$ in such a way that $\gamma(t_0) = 0$ and $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \cap \Sigma = \{(u,v) : v = F_0(u)\}$ for some holomorphic map $F_0 : \Delta^q \longrightarrow \Delta^n$. By the Hausdorff continuity of our family $\{\Gamma_{f_s}\}$ in s_0 $\Gamma_{f_s} \cap \Omega = \{(u,v) : v = F_s(u)\}$ for s close to s_0, F_s holomorphic and continuously depending on s.

Take $t_1 \in T$ close to t_0, such that $\gamma([0,t_1]) \subset \Sigma$. We have some neighborhoods $V_{t_1} \ni s_0, \Omega_{t_1} \ni \gamma(t_1)$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ extends analytically to $V_{t_1} \times \Omega_{t_1}$. Let $u_1 \in \Delta^q$ be such that $\gamma(t_1) = (u_1, F_0(u_1))$. Then there is a neighborhood, say $\Delta^q_r(u_1)$, such that $\Gamma_{f_s} \cap (V_{t_1} \times \Delta^q_r(u_1) \times \Delta^n)$ is defined by the equation $v = F(u,s)$, where $F(u,s) = F_s(u) : V_{t_1} \times \Delta^q_r(u_1) \to \Delta^n$ as above. From the condition of the *Lemma* we see that for $s \in S$ close to s_0 $F(u,s)$ extends onto Δ^q. So by *Lemma 2.1.1* $F(u,s)$ extends holomorphically to $V_{t_0,\varepsilon} \times \Delta^q_{1-\varepsilon}$, where ε is arbitrarily small ($V_{t_0,\varepsilon}$ depending on ε). But this means that $\mathcal{F}$ extends analytically onto $V_{t_0} \times \Delta^q_{1-\varepsilon} \times \Delta^n$. Thus T is closed and coinsides with $[0,1]$.

We proved in fact that for any compact subset $R \subset Reg\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \cap (W_1 \times X)$ there are neighborhoods $V_R \ni s_0, \Omega_R \supset R$ such that Γ_f analytically extend to $V_R \times \Omega_R$.

Step 2. Cover the set $Sing\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \cap [\{s_0\} \times \bar{W}_1 \times X]$ with a finite number of open charts of the form $1/2V_\alpha \times \Omega_\alpha$, where $V_\alpha \cong \Delta^q$ and $\Omega_\alpha \cong \Delta^n$, and such that $\Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \cap (V_\alpha \times \Omega_\alpha)$ is analytic cover of V_α. By Step 1 we can find an open neighborhoods $V_R \ni s_0$ and $\Omega_R \supset R = \Gamma_{f_{s_0}} \setminus [\bigcup_\alpha 1/2V_\alpha \times \Omega_\alpha]$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ analytically extends to $V_R \times \Omega_R$.

Fix now some α. All that remained to prove is that Γ_f analytically extends to $V'_\alpha \times V_\alpha \times \Omega_\alpha$ for some neighborhood of $V'_\alpha \ni s_0$. But this again follows from Lemma 2.1.1 applied to the coefficients of polynomials which define the cover $\Gamma_{f_s} \cap (V_\alpha \times \Omega_\alpha) \to V_\alpha$.

q.e.d.

Divide the variables in $\mathbb{C}^n = \mathbb{C}^{p+q}$ into two groups : $(z_1, ..., z_p)$ and $(u_1, ..., u_q)$. Let Γ an analytic set in $\Delta^n \times X$. Fix some $0 < r < 1$ and put $\Gamma_z = \Gamma \cap (\{z\} \times \Delta^q \times X)$. Consider a function

$$v_\Gamma(z) = vol_{2q}(\Gamma_z) = \int_{\Gamma_z} (dd^c\|u\|^2 + w_h)^q. \tag{2.4.3}$$

Here, as usually w_h denotes the $(1,1)$-form canonically accosiated to h. This is well defined for $z \in \Delta^p$, for which $\dim(\Gamma_z) = q$. Denote the set of such z as U. $T := \Delta^p \setminus U$ is contained in at most countable union of locally closed proper analytic subvarieties of Δ^p, see [F]. We shall make use of the following result of D. Barlet:

the function v_Γ is locally bounded on Δ^p,

see [B] Théorème 3.

Corollary 2.4.2. *If $f : \Delta^n \to X$ is a meromorphic map then the Lelong numbers $\Theta((f^*w)^q, 0)$ are finite for all $q = 1, ..., n$.*

Proof. This is the same as to bound the Lelong numbers of the currents $(dd^c\|z\|^2 + f^*w_h)^q$ Put $z' = (z_{i_1}, ..., z_{i_q})$ and $z'' = (z_{j_1}, ..., z_{j_{n-q}})$. We have

$$\frac{1}{r^{2p}} \int_{\Delta^p_r \times \Delta^q_r} (f^*w + dd^c\|z'\|^2)^q \wedge (dd^c\|z''\|^2)^p = \frac{1}{r^{2p}} \int_{\Delta^p_r} (dd^c\|z''\|^2)^p \int_{\Gamma_{z''}} (dd^c\|z'\|^2 + w)^q =$$

$$= \frac{1}{r^{2p}} \int_{\Delta^p_r} (dd^c\|z''\|^2)^p v_\Gamma(z'') \leq C \cdot \frac{vol(\Delta^p_r)}{r^{2p}} \leq C_1$$

by the Barlet Theorem.

q.e.d.

2.5. The Rothstein-type extension theorem and separate meromorphicity.

Lemmas 2.3.1 and 2.4.1 together with estimate in 3.2 will play a key role in the proof of the main result of this paper. Hovewer we shall break here the main line of exposition to show how they can be already applied to the classical question entitled above.

We are going to treat the question of separate meromorhpicity in the form proposed by Kazaryan and moreover, we are going to show the condition on the image space X to possess the mer.ext.property is "almost" not needed. It was F. Hartogs who proved his

"Hartogs-type" extension theorem for holomorphic functions in order to derive from this his separate holomophicity theorem. Rothstein did this for meromorphic functions, starting from E. Levi extension theorem. B. Shiffman fulfilled this program for meromorphic mappings. Namely he proved in [Sh-2] that if the complex space X possess a meromorphic extension property in dimension n then separately meromorphic mappings from Δ^n to X are meromorphic.

We shall prove here the Rothstein-type extension and separate meromorphicity in the form of Siciak and Kazaryan. If the space X posess a hol.ext.prop. the separate holomorphicity in the form of Siciak was obtained, using the approach of Shiffman, by O. Alehyane in [A-1].

Corollary 2.5.1 *Let $V \subset \mathbb{C}^p$ and $W_0 \subset\subset W \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ be a domains and let E a nonpluripolar subset of V. Let further a meromorphic mapping $f : V \times W_0 \to X$ into a complex space X is given. Suppose that for $z \in E$ the restriction $f_z := f \mid_{\{z\}\times W_0}$ is well defined and extends meromrophically onto $\{z\} \times W$. Then there is a pluripolar subset $E' \subset E$ such that f meromorphically extends onto a neighborhood of $V \times W_0 \cup (E \setminus E') \times W$.*

Proof. Take an exaustion $W_0 \subset\subset W_1 \subset\subset ...$ of W by relatively compact domains. For every n we shall find a pluripolar subset $E'_n \subset E$ such that f extends meromorphically to the neighborhood P_n of $V \times W_0 \cup (E \setminus E'_n) \times W_n$. Then $P := \bigcup_{n\geq 1} W_n$ will be a neighborhood of $V \times W_0 \cup (E \setminus \bigcup_{n\geq 1} E'_n) \times W = V \times W_0 \cup (E \setminus E') \times W$, where $E' := \bigcup_{n\geq 1} E'_n$ is pluripolar in V by the Josefson theorem. Finally f is extended to this neighborhood.

So, we can suppose additionaly that there is a domain $\tilde{W} \supset\supset W$ such that for any $z \in E$ f_z is well defined and extends meromorphically onto $cl(\tilde{W})$-closure of $\tilde{W}$.

Next, fix some compact exhaustion $K_1 \subset\subset ... \subset\subset K_n \subset\subset ...$ of X. Denote now by E_n the set of those $z \in E$ that $f_z(\tilde{W}) \subset K_n$. While $\bigcup_{(n)} E_n = E$, starting from some n_0 all E_n are not pluripolar. If we shall prove that there exists a pluripolar E'_n and extension of f into the neighborhood of $V \times W_0 \cup (E_n \setminus E'_n) \times W$, then again using Josefson theorem we can finish the proof.

Thus we may additionally suppose that there is a compact $K \subset\subset X$ such that $f_z(\tilde{W}) \subset K$ for all $z \in E$.

Take ν as in Lemma 2.4.1 for $W_0 \subset\subset W \subset\subset \tilde{W}$ and K. Let R be the maximal open subset of E such that f extends to the neighborhood of $V \times W_0 \cup R \times W$. Put $S = E \setminus R$. Put further

$$S_k = \{z \in S : vol(\Gamma_{f_z}) \leq k\frac{\nu}{2}\}, \tag{2.5.1}$$

where graphs are taken over $\tilde{W}$. Note that by Lemma 2.3.1 S_k are closed and they are increasing. Also $\bigcup_{k\geq 1} S_k = S$. By Lemma 2.4.1 and maximality of $R = E \setminus S$ the sets $S_{k+1} \setminus S_k$ are not locally regular at any of their points. Thus the sets $S_1, S_2 \setminus S_1, ...$ are pluripolar and so is S.

q.e.d.

Remarks. 1. If $E = V$ and X posseses a mer.ext. property then we obtain the result of B. Shiffman, see [Sh-2].

2. If X is compact and Kähler then it satisfies this assumption, see [Iv-2].

3. Let X posseds a meromorphic extension property in dimension $p+q$. Then f extends onto the envelope of holomorphy of the neighborhood of $V \times W_0 \cup (E \setminus E') \times W$, which is

obviously a neighborhood of $V \times W_0 \cup E^* \times W$. Here we denote by E^* the set of locally regular points of E.

4. Let us give the following

Definition 2.5.1. We shall say that meromorphic mappings into complex space X satisfy:

(h) a Hartogs-type extension theorem in bidimension (p,q) if every meromorphic map from

$$H_q^p(r) = \{(z_1, \dots, z_{p+q}) \in \mathbb{C}^{p+q} : \|z'\| < r, \|z^{''}\| < 1 \text{ or } \|z'\| < 1, 1 - r < \|z''\| < 1\}, \quad (2.5.2)$$

to X extend meromorphically onto Δ^{p+q}. Here $z' = (z_1, \dots, z_p)$, $z'' = (z_{p+1}, \dots, z_{p+q})$;

(t) a strong Thullen-type extension theorem in bidimension (p,q) if for any closed pluripolar subset S of Δ^q every meromorphic map from

$$T_q^p(S, a, b) := (\Delta^q \times \Delta^p(a)) \cup ((\Delta^q \setminus S) \times \Delta^p(b)) \quad (2.5.3)$$

to X extends meromorphically onto Δ^{p+q}, here $a < b$.

Note that Hartogs (p,q)-extendibility obviously implies the strong Thullen - type one. Vice versa is not true. Example is given by a 3-fold constructed by M. Kato in [Ka-2].

Namely Kato had constructed a compact three-fold X, which is a quotient of $D = \{[z_0 : \dots : z_3] \in \mathbb{CP}^3 : |z_0|^2 + |z_1|^2 < |z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2\}$ by a co-compact properly discontinuous subgroup $G \subset Aut(D)$. Denote by $\pi : D \to X$ the natural projection. Consider a hyperplane $P = \{z \in \mathbb{CP}^3 : z_0 = 0\} \cong \mathbb{CP}^2$. Then $D \cap P = \mathbb{CP}^2 \setminus \bar{\mathbb{B}}^2$, here $\mathbb{B}^2$ is a ball $\{|z_1|^2 > |z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2\}$ in $\mathbb{CP}^3$. Thus $\pi \mid_{D \cap P}: \mathbb{CP}^2 \setminus \bar{\mathbb{B}}^2 \to X$ cannot be extended onto the neighborhood of any point on $\partial\mathbb{B}^2$. So meromorphic mappings into X are not Hartogs (1,1)-extendable.

Let now $f : T_1^1(S, 1/2, 1) \to X$ be some meromorphic map. While $f : T_1^1(S, 1/2, 1)$ is simply-connected we can consider a lifting $F = \pi^{-1} \circ f : f : T_1^1(S, 1/2, 1) \to D \subset \mathbb{CP}^3$. By a Thullen-type extension theorem for meromorphic functions F extends onto Δ^2. But $F(\Delta^2) \cap \partial D = \emptyset$ because one cannot touch ∂D by bidisk. Thus $\pi \circ F$ gives an extension of f onto Δ^2.

We have the following obvious corollary.

Corollary 2.5.2. *If in the conditions of the Corollary 2.5.1 a complex space X possess a strong Thullen-type extension property in bidimension (p, q) and $E = V$ then f extends meromorphically onto $V \times W$.*

Let us turn now to the separate meromorphicity.

Corollary 2.5.3. *Let E and G be a nonpluripolar subsets in domains $V \subset \mathbb{C}^p$ and $W \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ respectively. Let F be some pluripolar subset of in $V \times W$. Let further some mapping $f : E \times G \setminus F \to X$ into a complex space X is given. Suppose that:*

(i) for every $z \in E$, such that $\{z\} \times G \not\subset F$ the restriciton $f_z := f \mid_{\{z\} \times G}$ is well defined and meromorphically extends meromorphically onto $\{z\} \times G$, and

(ii) for every $w \in G$, such that $V \times \{w\} \not\subset F$ the restriciton $f^w z := f \mid_{V \times \{w\}}$ is well defined and meromorphically extends meromorphically onto $V \times \{w\}$.

Then there are pluripolar subsets $E' \subset E$, $G' \subset G$ and a meromorphic mapping $\tilde{f}$ of some neighborhood of $(E \setminus E') \times W \cup V \times (G \setminus G')$ into X which extends f.

Proof. Withought loss of generality as in the proof of Rothstein-type theorem, we suppose that f_z extends onto $cl(\tilde{W})$ for some $\tilde{W} \supset\supset W$ and for all $z \in E$, and that there is a compact $K \subset\subset X$ such that $f_z(\tilde{W}) \subset K$ for all $z \in E$. The same for f^w-s.

Step 1. There is a point $Z_0 = (z_0, w_0) \in E \times G$ such that f holomorphically extend to the neighborhood of Z_0.

Define

$$E_k = \{z \in E : vol(\Gamma_{f_z}) \leq k\frac{\nu}{2}\}. \tag{2.5.4}$$

While E is not pluriolar, there exists k and $z_1 \in E_{k+1} \setminus E_k$ such that $E_{k+1} \setminus E_k$ is locally regular at z_1. The same reasoning as at the begining of the proof of Lemma 2.4.1 shows that the family $\{\Gamma_{f_z} : z \in E_{k+1} \setminus E_k\}$ is continuous in the neighborhood of z_1. Take a point $w_0 \in W$ such that f_{z_1} is *holomorphic* in the neighborhood of w_0. Remark that this w_0 can be taken to be a locally regular point of $G_{l+1} \setminus G_l$ for some l. From Hausdorff continuity of our family in the the neighborhood of z_1 we get immediately that all f_z are holomorphic in the neighborhood of w_0 for $z \in E_{k+1} \setminus E_k$ close to z_1. Find a point z_0 close to z_0 where f^{w_0} is holomorphic. Now the separate analyticity theorem for functions tells us thatthe point $Z_0 = (z_0, w_0)$ is as needed.

Step 2. End of the proof.

Applying two times coordinatevise the Rothstein theorem we get the statement.

q.e.d.

Remark.
1. Again, as above, if X posseds a mer.ext.prop. then we can take $E \setminus E' = E^*$ and $G \setminus G' = G^*$. This case was studied recently in [A-2], using approach developped in [Sh-2] and [Sh-3].
2. In the case $X = \mathbb{CP}^1$ we obtain the theorem of Kazaryan, see [Kz].

3 . Estimates of Lelong numbers from below.

3.1. Generalities on blowings-up.

First we recall the Hironaka Resolution Singularities Theorem. We shall use the so called embedded resolution of singularities, see [H], [B-M]. Let us recall the notion of the sequence of local blowings up over a complex manifold D. Take a point $s_0 \in D_0 := D$. Let V_0 be some neighbourhood of s_0 and l_0 smooth, closed submanifold of V_0 of codimension at least two, passing through s_0. Denote by $\pi_1 : D_1 \longrightarrow V_0$ the blowing up of V_0 along l_0. Call this *a local blowing up of D_0 along the locally closed center l_0.* The exceptional divisor $\pi^{-1}(l_0)$ of this blowing up we denote by E_1.

We can repeat this procedure, taking a point $s_1 \in D_1$, a neighborhood V_1 of that point in D_1 and smooth closed submanifold l_1 in V_1 of codimension at least two.

Definition 3.1.1. A finite sequence $\{\pi^j\}_{j=1}^N$ of such local blowings up we call *a sequence of local blowings up over $s_0 \in D$,* or a *local regular modification.*

By $\{l_j\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$ we denote the corresponding centers in the neighborhoods $\{V_j\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$ of points $\{s_j\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$, and by $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^N$ the exceptional divisors, $s_j \in D_j$.

If $V_j = D_j$ for all $j = 0, ..., N-1$, and points s_j are not specified we call this sequence a sequence of (global) blowings up or *a regular modification.* In this case we put $\pi = \pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_N$, $\hat{D} = D_N$, E denotes the exceptional divisor of π, i.e. $E = \pi_N^{-1}(l_{N-1} \cup ... \cup (\pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_N)^{-1}(l_0)$.

Theorem. *Let L be a subvariety of D. Then there exists a regular (not local!) modification $\pi : \hat{D} \to D$ such that:*

1) the strict transform $\hat{L}$ of L is smooth;

2) $l_i \subset Sing L_i$, where L_i is a strict transform of L by $\pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_j$.

See [H].

For the proof we refer to [B-M].

Remark. We shall use this Theorem only for the case $dim\ D = 3$ and $dim L = 1$. Tn this case (while $dim\ Sing L = 0$), we need only blowings up of points to resolve the singularities of L. We shall need also the following three Lemmas about the behavior of meromorphic mappings under the modifications. First let us introduce some more notations. Let $f : D \setminus S \to X$ be a meromorphic map into a complex space X. Here D is a manifold and S supposed to be closed and zero dimensional.

Definition 3.1.2. *Recall that a closed subset S of a metric space is called zero dimensional if for any $s_0 \in S$ and for almosr all $r > 0$ the sphere centered at s_0 of radii r do not intersect S.*

By $I(f)$ we shall denote the set of points of indeterminacy of f. By $I_p(f)$ those components of $I(f)$ which have dimension at least p. By $I_{p,s}(f)$ the set of components from $I_p(f)$ which pass through the point s; by $I_{p,R}(f)$-the set of those components from $I_p(f)$ which intersect the set R.

Remark also that if l is an (irreducible) analytic set in $D \setminus S$ of pure dimension $p \geq 1$, then its closure is an (irreducible) analytic subset of D, provided S is zerodimensional.

Lemma 3.1.1. *Let $f : B_*^n \to X$ be a holomorphic map of punctured n-ball, $n \geq 2$, into a complex space X which meromorphically extends onto B^n. Suppose one can find a sequence $\{\pi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of blowings-up in such a way that:*

(i) π_1 is a blow-up of $B_0^n := B^n$ at $s_{0,1} = 0$; $B_1^n := \pi_1^{-1}(B_0^n)$.

(ii) π_{j+1} is a blow-up of B_j^n at points $\{s_{j,1}, ..., s_{j,N_j}\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_{j-1}} \pi_j^{-1}(s_{j-1,i})$; here $N_0 = 1$.

(iii) $f_j := f \circ (\pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_j)$ is holomorphic on $B_j^n \setminus \{s_{j,1}, ..., s_{j,N_j}\}$.

Then there exists j_0 such that f_{j_0} is holomorphic on $B_{j_0}^n$.

Proof. By $\Gamma_f \subset B^n \times X$ denote the graph of f. Put $\Gamma = \Gamma_f \cap (\{0\}) \times X)$. Write $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \Gamma_i$-decomposition into irreducible components. Put $E_{j+1,i} = \pi_{j+1}^{-1}(s_{j,i}), i = 1, ..., N_j, E_{j+1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} E_{j+1,i}$ - the exceptional divisor of π_{j+1}. Usually we denote by $E_{j+1,i}$ also all strict transforms of it by subsequent blowings-up.

Step 1. For every $i = 1, ..., N$ there are a j and $1 \leq k \leq N_j$ such that $f_{j+1}(E_{j+1,k}) = \Gamma_i$.

We shall prove this for $i = 1$. Take a point $a \in Reg \Gamma_1 \setminus (\bigcup_{i=2}^{N} \Gamma_i)$. There is a holomorphic map $\phi : \Delta^2 \to \Gamma_f$, such that:

(i) $\phi(\Delta \times \{0\}) = a$,

(ii) $\phi(\Delta^2 \setminus (\Delta \times \{0\})) \subset \Gamma_f \cap (B_*^n \times X)$,

(iii) for any $z' \in \Delta$ the map $\phi_{z'} := \phi \mid_{\{z'\}\times\Delta}$ is proper and primitive (i.e. not multiple covered).

Such map can be constructed first as imbedding into the smooth manifold $\tilde{\Gamma}_h$, which is a modification of Γ_f. One should only chose ϕ to be transversal to the exceptional divisor of smoothing modification $\pi : \tilde{\Gamma}_f \to \Gamma_f$ on each disk $\{z'\}\times\Delta$, and then take $\pi\circ\phi$ as ϕ.

Put $\psi = p_1 \circ \phi$, where $p_1 : B^n \times X \to B^n$ is a natural projection, and $\psi_{z'} := \psi \mid_{\{z'\}\times\Delta}$ for $z' \in \Delta$. By $\psi^j : \Delta^2 \to B^n_j$ denote the lift $(\pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_j)^{-1} \circ \psi$ of ψ by $\pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_j$.

There is a j such that $\psi^j_{0'}$ is an imbedding of Δ (after shrinking Δ if necessary). So (after shrinking of Δ), $\psi_{z'}$ is also imbedding for all $z' \in \Delta$. Remark that for all $z' \in \Delta$ by construction one has $\lim_{z_k\to 0}(f_j \circ \psi^j_{z'})(z_k) = a$.

Case 1. $\psi^j_{0'}(0) \notin \{s_{j,1}, ..., s_{j,N_j}\}$ for some j.

In this case clearly $f_j(E_{j,i}) = \Gamma_1$, where $i \in \{1, ..., N_j\}$ is such that $E_{j,i} \ni \psi^j_{0'}(0)$.

Case 2. $\psi^j_{0'}(0) = s_{j,i_j}$ for all j.

Then there exists j_1 such that $\psi^{j_1}_{z'}(0) \neq \psi^{j_1}_{0'}(0)$ for $z' \neq 0$, but $\psi^{j_1-1}_{z'}(0) = \psi^{j_1-1}_{0'}(0)$. Now one can take some z'_0 instead of $0'$ for which $\psi^{j_1}_{z'_0} \notin \{s_{j_1,1}, ..., s_{j_1,N_{j_1}}\}$ and repeat the *Case 1.*

Step 2. Let ν be from (2.4.1) for some fixed Hermitian metric h on X and some compact $K \supset f(B^n_{\frac{1}{2}})$. Then by *Lemma* 3.2.1 the sum of Lelong numbers of currents $f^*w + dd^c\|z\|^2, ..., (f^*w + dd^c\|z\|^2)^n$ is $\geq N \cdot \nu$.

If f_{j_1} is not holomorphic say in $s_{j_1,1}$ we can take this point instead of zero and repeat the *Step 1.* If this procedure doesn't stop then the sum of Lelong numbers must be infinite. This contradics the meromorphicity of f at zero, see *Corollary 2.4.2.*

q.e.d.

Let $f_0 : D_0 \setminus S_0 \to X$ be a meromorphic mapping into a complex space X, S_0-being zerodimensional, $s_0 \in S_0$, $\dim D_0 = 3$. Put $\{l^{(0)}_1, ..., l^{(0)}_{R_0}\} = I_{1,s_0}(f_0)$.

Suppose that $l^{(0)}_1$ is smooth. Consider the following sequence of blowings-up.

1) $p_1 : D_1 \to D_0$ is a blowing up of D_0 along $l^{(0)}_1$. By E_1 denote the exceptional divisor of p_1.

Suppose that $f_1 := f_0 \circ p_1$ meromorphically extends onto $D_1 \setminus S_1$ with S_1 being zerodimensional. Take some $s_1 \in p_1^{-1}(s_0) \cap S_1$ (if such exists). Let $p'_1 : D'_1 \to D_1$ be a regular modification resolving the singularities of all noncompact components of $I_{1,s_1}(f_1)$ which are contained in E_1. Denote them (and their strict transforms) by $l^{(1)}_1, ..., l^{(1)}_{P_1}$.

2) $p_2 : D_2 \to D_1$ is the composition with p'_1 of the regular modification $p''_1 : D_2 \to D'_1$ which is successive blown-up of $l^{(1)}_1$, then $l^{(1)}_2$, and so on till $l^{(1)}_{P_1}$. By E_2 we denote the exceptional divisor of $p_1 \circ p_2$.

n) Suppose that $p_n : D_n \to D_{n-1}$ is constructed.

By E_n denote the exceptional divisor of $p_1 \circ ... \circ p_n$. Suppose that $f_n := f_{n-1} \circ p_n$ meromorphically extends onto $D_n \setminus S_n$ with S_n being zerodimensional. Take some $s_n \in p_n^{-1}(s_{n-1}) \cap S_n$ (if such exists). Let $p'_n : D'_n \to D_n$ be a regular all noncompact components

of $I_{1,s_n}(f_n)$ which are contained in E_n. Denote them (and their strict transforms) by $l_1^{(n)},...,l_{P_n}^{(n)}$.

n+1) $p_{n+1} : D_{n+1} \to D_n$ is the composition with $p_n^{'}$ of the regular modification $p_n^{''} : D_{n+1} \to D_n^{'}$ which is successive blown-up of $l_1^{(n)}$, then $l_2^{(n)}$, and so on till $l_{P_n}^{(n)}$. By E_{n+1} we denote the exceptional divisor of $p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n+1}$.

Lemma 3.1.2. *There exists a n_0 and $s_{n_0} \in S_{n_0} \cap (p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0})^{-1}(s_0)$ such that no noncompact component of $I_{1,s_{n_0}}(f_{n_0})$ is contained in E_{n_0} - the exeptional divisor of $p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0}$.*

Remark. This means that after applying R_0-times this *Lemma* we get a regular modification $p_{n_1} : (D_{n_1}, S_{n_1}, f_{n_1}) \to (D_0, S_0, f_0)$ and a point $s_{n_1} \in S_{n_1} \cap p_{n_1}^{-1}(s_0)$ such that all components of $I_{1,s_{n_1}}(f_{n_1})$ are compact and contained in $p_{n_1}^{-1}(s_0)$.

Proof. The proof follows from the previous *Lemma 3.1.1* by sections. Take a point $a_0^{'} \in l_1^{(0)} \setminus S_0$. Find a coordinates z_1, z_2, z_3 in the polydisk neighborhood Δ^3 of $a_0^{'}$ such that

(i) $a_0^{'} = 0$,
(ii) $\Delta^3 \cap S_0 = \emptyset$,
(iii) $\Delta^3 \cap l_1^{(0)} = \{z : z_1 = z_2 = 0\}$.

For $z' \in \Delta^2_{z_2 z_3}$ we put $\Delta_{z'} = \{z'\} \times \Delta$ and $f_{z'} := f \mid_{\Delta_{z'}}$. Let ν_1 be from *Lemma* 2.3.1. Put $\Sigma_0 = \emptyset$ and

$$\Sigma_j = \{z' \in \Delta^2 : vol(\Gamma_{f_{z'}}) \leq \frac{\nu_1}{2} \cdot j\}, \text{ for } j \geq 1. \tag{3.1.1}$$

From (2.3.2) we see that Σ_j are closed, $\Sigma_j \subset \Sigma_{j+1}$, and $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_j = \Delta^2$. Find $j_1 \geq 1$ such that $\Sigma_{j_1} \setminus \Sigma_{j_1 - 1}$ contains a closed disk $\Delta(a_0^{''}) \subset l_1^{(0)}$ centered at $a_0^{''} \in l_1^{(0)}$. Note that by *Lemma* 2.3.1 and the fact the *f is not holomorphic* in the neighborhood of $a_0^{''}$ it follows that Σ_{j_1} is contained in a proper analytic set in the neighborhood of $a_0^{''}$ in Δ^2. So we can find a disk $\Delta(a_0) \subset \Delta(a_0^{''})$ such that for some $r_0 > 0$ $(\Delta_{r_0} \times \Delta(a_0) \setminus \{0\} \times \Delta(a_0)) \subset \bigcup_{j > j_1} \Sigma_j$. Remark that if $z_1^{'} \in \{0\} \times \Delta(a_0)$ and $z_2^{'} \in (\Delta_{r_0} \times \Delta(a_0) \setminus (\Delta(a_0) \times \{0\})$ one has a jump of volume: $|vol(\Gamma_{f_{0,z_1^{'}}}) - vol(\Gamma_{f_{0,z_2^{''}}})| \geq \nu_1/2$.

Suppose that for all n the set E_n contains a noncompact component of $I(f_n)$, which projects by $p_1 \circ ... \circ p_n$ onto $l_1^{(0)}$. Repeating the arguments above we can construct a next sequence:

(i) a_n a point on $l_1^{(n)}$;

(ii) a disk $\Delta(a_n)$ and disk Δ_{r_n} such that if $z_1^{'} \in \{0\} \times \Delta(a_n)$ and $z_2^{'} \in \Delta_{r_n}) \times \Delta(a_n)) \setminus (\{0\} \times \Delta(a_n))$ one has a jump of volume: $|vol(\Gamma_{f_{n,z_1^{'}}}) - vol(\Gamma_{f_{n,z_2^{''}}})| \geq \nu_1/2$.

(iii) $p_n(\Delta(a_n) \subset\subset \Delta(a_{n-1})$.

Let $a \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty}(p_1 \circ ... \circ p_n)(\Delta(a_n))$. Take a two-ball B_a^2 centered at a and transversal to $l_1^{(0)}$. Note that if this ball was chosen sufficiently small that $f \mid_{B_a^2}$ is meromorphic and by properties (i)-(iii) above all $f \circ (p_n \circ ... \circ p_1)$ are *essentially meromorphic* i.e. not holomorphic. This contradics *Lemma* 3.1.1.

q.e.d.

In the sequel we shall repeatedly use the following statement.

Lemma 3.1.3. *Let $f : H^{n+1}(r) \to X$ be a meromorphic map into a complex space X, which possess a meromorphic extension property in dimension n. Then f meromorphically extends onto $\Delta^{n+1} \setminus S$, where $S = S_1 \times ... \times S_{n+1}$ and all $S_j \subset \Delta$ are of harmonic measure zero.*

Proof. We shall prove that f extends meromorphically onto $E^{n+1}(r) \setminus S$ with S as described. Here

$$E^{n+1}(r) = (\Delta_r^{n-1} \times \Delta_r \times \Delta) \cup (\Delta_r^{n-1} \times \Delta \times A_{1-r,1}) = \bigcup_{z_1 \in \Delta_r} E^n_{z_1}(r)$$

in notations of 2.2. This will clearly imply the statement of *Lemma*.

According to the assumption of n-dimensional extension property of X, for every $z_1 \in \Delta_r$ the restriction $f_{z_1} = f \mid_{E^n_{z_1}} (r)$ extends meromorphically onto $D_{z_1} := \{z_1\} \times \Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta^2$.

After shrinking, we can suppose that all f_{z_1} are meromorphic in the neighborhood of $\bar{D}_{z_1}$ in $\{z_1\} \times \mathbb{C}^n$. Put $D := \Delta_r^{n-2} \times \Delta^2$. Take $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider $D_\varepsilon = \{z \in D : d(z, \partial D) \geq \varepsilon\}$. Denote by Ω_ε the maximal open subset of Δ_r such that f meromorphically extends onto $\Omega \times D_\varepsilon$. Let $S^\varepsilon = \Delta_r \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$. Let ν_p be as in (5) of *Lemma 2.1.1*. Put $\nu = inf\{\nu_p \cdot \varepsilon^{2(n-p)} : p = 0, ..., n-1\}$.

Consider a following closed subsets of S^ε: $S^\varepsilon_j = \{z_1 \in S^\varepsilon : vol(\Gamma_{f_{z_1}}) \leq \frac{\nu}{2} \cdot j\}$. Note that $S^\varepsilon_{j+1} \supset S^\varepsilon_j$ and $S^\varepsilon = \cup_{(j)} S^\varepsilon_j$. $S^\varepsilon_{j+1} \setminus S^\varepsilon_j$ is of harmonic measure zero in $\Delta_r \setminus S^\varepsilon_j$. Really, would $s_0 \in S^\varepsilon_{j+1} \setminus S^\varepsilon_j$ be some regular point of S^ε_{j+1}, then by *Lemma 2.4.1* f would meromorphically extend onto $V \times D$ fore some neighborhood $V \ni s_0$. This contradics the maximality of Ω_ε. By the Josefson S^ε is polar.

Further $S_1 = \cup_\varepsilon S^\varepsilon$ is polar, so f extends onto $(\Delta_r \setminus S_1) \times D$. Repeating the same arguments for other coordinates we obtain the statement of *Lemma*.

q.e.d.

Consider a meromorphic map $f_0 : D_0 \setminus S_0 \to X$ into a complex space which possesses a meromorphic extension property in dimension n, S_0 is zerodimensional and $dim D_0 = n+1$. Let $\pi_1 : D_1 \to D_0$ be some regular modification.

Lemma 3.1.4. *$f_0 \circ \pi_1$ extends to a meromorphic map $f_1 : D_1 \setminus S_1 \to X$, where S_1 is zero dimensional, closed and pluripolar subset of D_1.*

The proof, which is similar to that of previous *Lemma*, will be omited.

We shall also make use of the fact that the set of harmonic measure zero on the plain has zero dimension, see [Gl].

Note that *Lemma 3.1.3* gives part (i) of *Theorem 2*.

3.2. Estimates.

Let X be a complex space, equipped with some Hermitian metric h. By ω we denote, as usually, (1,1)-form canonically associated with h. Let S_0 be some zero dimensional closed subset of a complex manifold D_0 and let $f : D_0 \setminus S_0 \longrightarrow X$ be some meromorphic map such that $cl(f(D_0 \setminus S_0)) \subset K$-some compact in X. Suppose that some sequence $\{\pi_j\}_{j=1}^N$ of local blowings-up $\pi_j : D_j \to D_{j-1}$ over the point $s_0 \in S_0$ is given. Denote by

f_j the lifting of f_{j-1} onto D_j, i.e. $f_j = f_{j-1} \circ \pi_j$, where $f_0 = f$. Suppose now that all f_j extend meromorphically onto $D_j \setminus S_j$, where S_j are closed zero dimensional subsets of D_j. As before, by l_{j-1} we denote the center of π_j and by $E_j = \pi_j^{-1}(l_{j-1})$ the corresponding exeptional divisor (and all its strict transforms under $\pi_{j+1}, ..., \pi_N$). Denote by $\hat{S} = S_N$ and by $\hat{D} = D_N$. Put also $\pi = \pi_1 \circ ... \circ^p i_N : \hat{D} \to D_0$. We suppose moreover that $f_j|_{E_j \setminus S_j}$ meromorphically extends onto E_j. For every $j = 1, ..., N$ by r_j denote the rank of $f_j|_{E_j}$.

Remark. In what follows the locall blowings up will appear in the following context. Take a point $s_j \in E_j$ and let l_j be the smooth *compact* component of $I_{1,s_j}(f_j)$ (note that $codiml_j \geq 2$). In this case we shall take $V_j = D_j$ and blow up D_j along l_j to obtain an exeptional divisor E_{j+1}. If l_j was compact then E_{j+1} is also compact. Such configurations will contribute to our estimates of Lelong numbers.

Consider now currents $T_p = (f^*\omega + dd^c\|z\|^2)^p$ on $D_0 \setminus (S_0 \cup I(f_0))$. More accurately the currents T_p one can define as $T_p = ((p_1 \mid_{\Gamma_f})_* p_2^* w + dd^c\|z\|^2)^p$. For each T_p we consider the Lelong number of T_p in s_0:

$$\Theta(T_p, s_0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \sup 1/\varepsilon^{2(n-p)} \int_{B_{s_0}(\varepsilon) \setminus (S_0 \cup I(f_0))} T_p \wedge (dd^c\|z\|^2)^{2(n-p)}, \tag{3.2.1}$$

which can of course take infinite value, $n = dimD_0$. By $\nu_p = \nu_p(K)$ we denote, as before the minima of volumes of p-dimensional compact subvarieties in X, which are contained in K. By σ_p denote the number of those j that l_j is compact and $r_{j+1} = p$.

Lemma 3.2.1. *There is a constant $C = C(h, K)$, depending only on Hertmitian metric h and compact K, such that for any meromorphic map f as above one has the next estimate for the Lelong numbers of the currents T_p in the point $s_0 \in S$:*

$$\Theta(T_p, s_0) \geq C \cdot \sigma_p \cdot \nu_p \tag{3.2.2}$$

Proof. Take only thouse E_{j_1} which are wlowings-up of *compact* l_{j_1-1} and $rkf_{j_1} \mid_{E_{j_1}} = p$. To simplify the notations in what follows we drop the subindice 1 in j-s.

Take an ε-neighborhood V^ε of $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\sigma_p} E_j$ with respect to some metrik on $\hat{D}$. Remove from V^ε the ε- neighborhood of intersections $E_i \cap E_j, i \neq j$, ε-neighborhood of $\hat{S}$ and ε-neighborhood of $I(f_N)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we obtain the union $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\sigma_p} V_j^\varepsilon$ of pairwise disjoint open sets: $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\sigma_p} V_j^\varepsilon = V^\varepsilon \setminus ((\bigcup_{i \neq j} E_i \cap E_j)^\varepsilon \cup \hat{S}^\varepsilon \cup I(f_N)^\varepsilon)$. By $\bar{V}_j^\varepsilon$ denote the closure of V_j^ε in $\hat{D}$.

Denote by W_j^ε the image of $\bar{V}_j^\varepsilon$ under the blown-down mapping $\pi : \hat{D} \to D_0$. Starting from here we put $s_0 = 0$. Note that for $\varepsilon > 0$ suffuciently small $W_j^\varepsilon \cap W_i^\varepsilon = \{0\}$ for $i \neq j$. Note further that $\pi^{-1} \mid_{W_j^\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}} : W_j^\varepsilon \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow \hat{D}$ is correctly defined and, in fact, $\pi^{-1}(W_j^\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}) = \bar{V}_j^\varepsilon \setminus E_j$. Denote by F_j^ε the closure in $D_0 \times X$ of the graph of $f \mid_{W_j^\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}}$.

So $F_j^\varepsilon \cap (\{0\} \times X)$ is compact in $\{0\} \times X$ of finite Hausdorff p-measure. In fact $F_j^\varepsilon \cap (\{0\} \times X)$ is the closure of the image of $f_N(E_j \setminus (S_j^\varepsilon \cup \bigcup_{i \neq j} E_i^\varepsilon) \cup I(f_N)^\varepsilon)$, so $F_j^\varepsilon \cap (\{0\} \times X)$ is contained in a compact subvariety $A_j = f(E_j)$ of $\{0\} \times X$ of complex dimension p.

Let K be a compact in X containing $cl(f(D_0 \setminus S_0))$. Cover K by a finite number of open sets $\{U_\alpha\}$, which are biholomorphic to an analytic subsets of $\Delta_\alpha^{m_1}$- unit polydisk in $\mathbb{C}^{m_1}, m_1 \geq m = dim X$. Appropriate coordinate functions on U_α are denoted by $u_1^\alpha, ..., u_{m_1}^\alpha$. In each $\Delta_\alpha^{m_1}$ find an orthonormal basis $e_\alpha^1, ..., e_\alpha^{m_1}$ of $(1,0)$-forms with respect to the Hermitian metric h_α on $\Delta_\alpha^{m_1}$, so that the form w_h can be written as $w_h = \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{i}{2} e_\alpha^j \wedge e_\alpha^{\bar{j}}$. Now put $\|u^\alpha\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} |u_j^\alpha|^2$ and express

$$\frac{i}{2}\partial\bar{\partial}\|u^\alpha\|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^{m_1} c_{j\bar{k}}^\alpha \frac{i}{2} e_\alpha^j \wedge \bar{e}_\alpha^k, \tag{3.2.3}$$

where $[c_{j\bar{k}}^\alpha]_{j,k=1}^{m_1}$ is strictly positive-definite matrix depending on $u_\alpha \in U_\alpha$. Find constants C_α^1, C_α^2 such that

$$C_\alpha^1 \cdot w_h \leq \frac{i}{2}\partial\bar{\partial}\|u_\alpha\|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^{m_1} c_{j\bar{k}}^\alpha \frac{i}{2} e_\alpha^j \wedge \bar{e}_\alpha^k \leq$$

$$\leq C_\alpha^2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{i}{2} e_\alpha^j \wedge \bar{e}_\alpha^k = C_\alpha^2 w_h. \tag{3.2.4}$$

Denote by $A_j^{-\varepsilon} := Reg A_j \setminus (f_j(E_j \cap S_j^\varepsilon \cap \bigcup_{i \neq j} E_i^\varepsilon)))$. Cover $A_j^{-\varepsilon}$ by a finite number of open sets V_i satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $V_i \subset\subset U_\alpha$ for some α.

If $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \Delta_\alpha^{m_1}$ is coordinate imbedding, and $\phi_\alpha \mid_{V_i}$ is a proper imbedding into some open subset $V_i^{'}$ of $\Delta_\alpha^{m_1}$, then on $V_i^{'}$ one can introduce coordinates $u_1^i, ..., u_{m_1}^i$ such that

(ii) $V_i^{'}$ is polydisk in coordinates u^i and $\phi_\alpha(V_i \cap A_j^{-\varepsilon}) = \{u^i : u_{p+1}^i = ... = u_{m_1}^i = 0\}$.

(iii) $\frac{1}{2} \cdot dd^c\|u^\alpha\|^2 \leq dd^c\|u^i\|^2 \leq 2 \cdot dd^c\|u^\alpha\|^2$.

(iv) Each point of $A_j^{-\varepsilon}$ belongs not more than to $2p+1$ of V_i.

If $p = m_1$, then the second condition is not needed. Put $U = V_i^{'}$ to simplify the notations and denote by B_r^n the ball of radiu r centered at zero, $0 < r < \varepsilon$, where ε is choosen suffuciently small to garantee that the restriction onto $F_j^\varepsilon \cap (B_r^n \times U)$ of the projection $pr : B^n \times U \longrightarrow B^n \times U_{u_1,...,u_p}$ is proper. Here $U = U_{u_1,...,u_p} \times U_{u_{p+1},...,u_{m_1}}$. We had droped the indice i in u^i.

Now put $C(K) = \max_\alpha\{C_\alpha^1, C_\alpha^2, 2\}$. Further put $Z_j = pr(F_j^\varepsilon \cap (B^n \times U)$. It is a closed subvariety of dimension n in $B^n \times U_{u_1,...,u_p}$.

Consider the following Hermitian metric on $B^n \times U_{u_1,...,u_p}$: $e = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{i}{2} dz_j \otimes d\bar{z}_j + \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{i}{2} du_k \otimes d\bar{u}_k$. Denote by $vol_e Z_j$ the volume of Z_j with respect to e. Then putting $\|u\|_1^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p |u_j|^2$, we have

$$vol_e(Z_j) \leq \int_{(B_r^n \times U) \cap F_j^\varepsilon} (dd^c(\|z\|^2 + \|u\|_1^2))^n \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{2^n}{n!} \int_{(B_r^n \times U) \cap F_j^\varepsilon} (dd^c(\|z\|^2 + \|u\|_1^2))^p \wedge (dd^c(\|z\|)^2)^{n-p} \leq$$

$$\leq C^p(K)\frac{2^n}{n!}\int_{(B_r^n\times U)\cap F_j^\varepsilon}(dd^c\|z\|^2+w)^p\wedge(dd^c\|z\|^2)^{n-p}=$$

$$=C(K)^p\frac{2^n}{n!}\int_{B_r^n\cap W_j^\varepsilon}T_p\wedge(dd^c\|z\|^2)^{n-p}. \tag{3.2.5}$$

From the well known lower bound of volumes of analytic varietes, see [A-T-U], one has

$$vol_{2n}(Z_j)\geq C\cdot r^{2n-2p}\cdot vol_{2p}(Z_j^0). \tag{3.2.6}$$

here $Z_j^0=Z_j\cap(\{0\}\times U)=A_j^{-\varepsilon}\cap U$ and C is absolute constant. Now from (3.2.5) and (3.2.6) we get that

$$C^p(K)\frac{2^n}{n!}\int_{B_r^n\times\cap W_j^\varepsilon}T_p\wedge(dd\bar{^c}(\|z\|)^2)^{n-p}\geq vol_e(Z_j)\geq$$

$$\geq C\cdot r^{2n-2p}vol_e(Z_j^0)=r^{2n-2p}C\cdot vol_e(A_j\cap U)\geq r^{2n-2p}C\cdot 1/C^p(K)\cdot vol_h(A_j\cap U).$$

So

$$\frac{1}{r^{2n-2p}}\int_{B_r^n\cap W_j^\varepsilon}T_p\wedge(dd^c\|z\|^2)^{2n-2p}\geq\frac{n!C^{2p}(K)}{2^n}\sum_i vol_h(A_j^{-\varepsilon}\cap V_i)\geq$$

$$\geq\frac{n!C^{2p}(K)}{2^n(2p+1)}vol_h(A_j^{-\varepsilon}).$$

Remained to take sum over $j=1,...,\sigma_p$ and let $\varepsilon\to 0$.

q.e.d.

Proof of Theorem 1.

(a) is proved in *Lemma 3.1.3.*

(b) Take a ball D_0 centered at s_0 and such that all components of $I_1(f_0)$ intersecting D_0 pass through s_0. Denote $S_0=D_0\cap S$ and put $f_0=f\mid_{D_0\setminus S_0}$. Denote by $l_1^{(0)},...,l_{N_0}^{(0)}$ all components of codimension two in $I_{s_0}(f_0)$. In the sequel we shall say that a regular modification $\pi:(D_1,S_1,f_1)\to(D_0,S_0,f_0)$ is given, having in mind that f_0 is defined and meromorphic on $D_0\setminus S_0$, where S_0 is zero dimensional, and that $f_1=f_0\circ\pi$ extends meromorphically onto $D_1\setminus S_1$, where S_1 again is zero dimensional by Lemma 3.1.4. We denote by $I_R(f)$ the set of all irreducible components of $I(f)$ which intersect the subset R.

Step 1. There is a regular modification $\pi_1:(D_1,S_1,f_1)\to(D_0,S_0,f_0)$, such that the set $I_{\pi_1^{-1}(s_0)}(f_1)$ doesn't contain components of codimension two, which π_1 maps onto some of $l_1^{(0)},...,l_{N_0}^{(0)}$.

Proof of Step 1. Let $p_1:(D_1,S_1,f_1)\to(D_0,S_0,f_0)$ be a regular modification which is a composition of resolution of singularities of $l_1^{(0)}$ and blow-up of strict transform of $l_1^{(0)}$. By $l^{(1)}=\{l_1^{(1)},...,l_{N_1}^{(1)}\}$ denote the set of all components of $I_{p_1^{-1}(s_0)}(f_1)$ whom p_1 projects onto $l_1^{(0)}$.

Further, let $p_2 : (D_2, S_2, f_2) \to (D_1, S_1, f_1)$ be a regular modification, which is a composition of resolution of singularities of all $l_1^{(1)}, ..., l_{N_1}^{(1)}$ and successive blowings-up of their strict transforms, and $f_2 = f_1 \circ p_2$.

Suppose $p_n : (D_n, S_n, f_n) \to (D_{n-1}, S_{n-1}, f_{n-1})$ is constructed. Let us denote by $l^{(n)} = \{l_1^{(n)}, ..., l_{N_n}^{(n)}\}$ the set of all components of $I_{1,(p_1 \circ ... \circ p_n)^{-1}}(f_n)$ whom $p_n \circ ... \circ p_1$ projects onto $l_1^{(0)}$. Let $p_{n+1} : (D_{n+1}, S_{n+1}, f_{n+1}) \to (D_n, S_n, f_n)$ be a regular modification, which is a composition of resolution of singularities of all $l_1^{(n)}, ..., l_{N_n}^{(n)}$ and successive blowing-up of their strict transforms. Again $f_{n+1} := f_n \circ p_{n+1}$.

Lemma 3.1.2 tells us that for some n_0 we have $l^{(n_0)} = \emptyset$. Denote by $l_1^{(n_0)}, ..., l_{N_{n_0}}^{(n_0)}$ the set of all components of $I_{(p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0})^{-1}}(f_{n_0})$ whom $p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0}$ projects onto some of $l_1^{(0)}, ..., l_{N_0}^{(0)}$. We proved that $(p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0})(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_{n_0}} l_i^{(n_0)}) \subset \bigcup_{i=2}^{N_0} l_i^{(0)}$.

By E_1 denote a component of the exeptional divisor of $p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0}$ such that $(p_1 \circ ... \circ p_{n_0})(E_1) = l_1^{(0)}$.

Repeating this procedure for the strict transform of $l_2^{(0)}$ instead of $l_1^{(0)}$ and so on till $l_{N_0}^{(0)}$ we get the regular modification $\pi_1 : (D_1, S_1, f_1) \to (D_0, S_0, f_0)$ such that no 1-dimensional component of $I(f_1)$ is mapped by π_1 onto some of $l_1^{(0)}, ..., l_{N_0}^{(0)}$. By E_j denote the union of the components of the exeptional divisor of π_1 such that $\pi_1(E_j) = l_j^{(0)}$. *Lemma* 3.1.2 gives us now the statement of Step 1.

By $l^{(1)} = l_1^{(1)}, ..., l_{N_1}^{(1)}$ denote the set of all one-dimensional componets of $I_{\pi_1^{-1}(s_0)}(f_1)$. Note that they all are contained in the fiber $\pi_1^{-1}(s_0)$. In particular they are compact.

Step 2. There is a regular modification $\pi_2 : (D_2, S_2, f_2) \to (D_1, S_1, f_1)$, such that the set $I_{(\pi_1 \circ \pi_2)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_2)$ doesn't contain any component of codimension two. Moreover $\Theta_{tl}(f^*w, s_0) \geq N_1 \cdot \nu$. Here the total Lelong number is defined as $\Theta_{tl}(f^*w, s_0) := = \Theta(f^*w, s_0) + \Theta((f^*w)^2, s_0)$ and N_1 is a number of 1-dimensional components of $I_{\pi_1^{-1}(s_0)}(f)$.

Proof of Step 2. Construct inductively the following sequence of regular modifications:

(1) $p_2 : (D_2, S_2, f_2) \to (D_1, S_1, f_1)$ is a composition of resolution of singularities of all $l_1^{(1)}, ..., l_{N_1}^{(1)}$ and successive blowings-up of their strict transforms.

Suppose $p_n : (D_n, S_n, f_n) \to (D_{n-1}, S_{n-1}, f_{n-1})$ is constructed. Let us denote by $l^{(n)} = \{l_1^{(n)}, ..., l_{N_n}^{(n)}\}$ the set of all one-dimensional components of $I_{(\pi_1 \circ p_2 \circ ... \circ p_n)^{-1}}(f_n)$ whom $\pi_1 \circ p_2 \circ ... \circ p_n$ projects onto some of $l_1^{(0)}, ..., l_{N_1}^{(0)}$.

(n+1) $p_{n+1} : (D_{n+1}, S_{n+1}, f_{n+1}) \to (D_n, S_n, f_n)$ is a regular modification, which is a composition of resolution of singularities of all $l_1^{(n)}, ..., l_{N_n}^{(n)}$ and successive blowing-up of their strict transforms.

By *Lemma* 3.1.2 for some n_1 we have $l^{(n_1)} = \emptyset$. This means that there are compact divisors $E_1^{(1)}, ..., E_{N_1}^{(1)}$ such that $p^{n_1} := \pi_1 \circ p_2 \circ ... \circ p_{n_1}$ maps $E_i^{(1)}$ onto $l_i^{(1)}$ and $f_{n_1} \mid_{E_i^{(1)} \setminus S_{n_1}}$ meromorphically extends onto $E_i^{(1)}$. *Lemma* 3.2.1 gives us $\Theta_{tl}(f^*w, s_0) \geq N_1 \cdot \nu$. Put $\pi_2 := p_2 \circ ... \circ p_{n_1}, D_2 := D_{n_1}, f_2 := f_{n_1}, S_2 := S_{n_1}$.

If $I_{(\pi_1\circ\pi_2)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_{n_1}) \neq \emptyset$ we can repeat this procedure for f_{n_1} instead of f_1 and obtain the following sequence of regular modifications:

$$... \stackrel{\pi_{n+1}}{\to} D_n \to ... \to D_2 \stackrel{\pi_2}{\to} D_1 \stackrel{\pi_1}{\to} D_0$$

Here, if we put $\pi^n = \pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_n$ and $l^{(n)} = \{l_1^{(n)},...,l_{N_n}^{(n)}\} = I_{1,(\pi^n)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_n)$, then $I_{1,(\pi^{n+1})^{-1}(s_0)}(f_{n+1})$ doesn't contain components which π^{n+1} maps onto some of $l_1^{(n)},...$ $...,l_{N_n}^{(n)}$. So if $I_{1,(\pi^n)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_n)$ is not empty for all n then $\Theta_{tl}(f^*w,s_0) \geq \Sigma_{i=1}^n N_i \cdot \nu$ for all n. This contradics the condition of the Theorem. Thus $I_{(\pi_1\circ\pi_2)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_{n_1}) = \emptyset$ for some n, and consequently $l^{(n)} = \emptyset$ for some n. Hence the *Step* 2 is proved.

Step 3. There is a regular modification $\pi_3 : (D_3,S_3,f_3) \to (D_0,S_0,f_0)$*, such that* f_3 *is holomorphic in the neighborhood of* $\pi_3^{-1}(s_0)$*.*

Proof of Step 3. Let $\pi_1 \circ \pi_2 : (D_2,S_2,f_2) \to (D_0,S_0,f_0)$ be a regular modification constructed in *Step* 2. If $S_2 \cap I_{(\pi_1\circ\pi_2)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_2)$ is not empty then take a point $s_2 \in S_2 \cap I_{(\pi_1\circ\pi_2)^{-1}(s_0)}(f_2)$. If $\pi_1 \circ \pi_2$ is not biholomorphic, then there is a compact curve $C \ni s_2$, $C \subset (\pi_1 \circ \pi_2)^{-1}(s_0)$, $C \cong \mathbb{CP}^1$. If $\pi_1 \circ \pi_2$ is biholomorphic take $C = \{z_2 = z_3 = 0\}$ - line in $D_0 = B^3$ with $s_0 \in C$.

By B^2 denote some two-ball transversal to C at s_2.

Case 1. $f_2 \mid_{B^2 \setminus S_2}$ *holomorphically extends onto* B^2*.*

In this case f_2 is holomorphic in the neighborhood of s_2. To see this, take a Stein neighborhood W of $\Gamma_{f(\bar{B}^2)}$ in $D_2 \times X$. Then the needed statement follows from the Hartogs extension theorem for holomorphic functions. But this contradicts the choice of s_2.

Case 2. $f_2 \mid_{B^2}$ *is not holomorphic (i.e. essentially meromorphic).*

Denote by $p_3 : \hat{B}^2 \to B^2$ the finite sequence of blowings-up of points such that $f_2 \circ p_3 : \hat{B}^2 \to X$ is holomorphic. Take a regular modification $\pi_3 : D_3 \to D_2$ as an extension of p_3 along C. Let p_3' (correspondingly π_3' be the last blowing-up in the sequence p_3 (corr.π_3). Let l_3 (corr.E_3) denote the exeptional divisor of p_3' (corr.π_3'). Then either $(f_2 \circ \pi_3) \mid_{E_3}$ is nonconstant or $l_3 \in I_{1,\pi_3^{-1}(s_0)}(f_2 \circ \pi_3)$. In both cases we have a contribution to $\Theta_{tl}(f^*w,s_0)$ of at least ν. If $f_2 \circ \pi_3$ is not holomorphic in the neighborhood of $(\pi_2 \circ \pi_3)^{-1}(s_0)$ then take π_4 to be a composition of a regular modification described in *Step 2* and just above. We get a sequence of regular modifications

$$... \stackrel{\pi_{n+1}}{\to} D_n \to ... \to D_2 \stackrel{\pi_2}{\to} D_1 \stackrel{\pi_1}{\to} D_0$$

such that $\Theta_{tl}(f^*w,s_0) \geq n \cdot \nu$. So it is finite by the assumption of the Theorem. That means that for $f_n \circ \pi_n$ with n big enough only the first case can occur. Thus $f_n \circ \pi_n$ is holomorphic in the neighborhood of $(\pi_1 \circ ... \circ \pi_n)^{-1}(s_0)$.

The proof of *Step 3* and thus of *Theorem 1* is completed.

q.e.d.

References.

[**A-1**] Alehyane O.: *Une extension du théorème de Hartogs pour les applications séparément holomorphes.* C.R.Acad.Sci. Paris, t.323, Série I (1996).

[**A-2**] Alehyane O.: *Applications séparément méromorphes dans les espaces analytique.* Preprint.

[**A-T-U**] Alexander H., Taylor B., Ullman J.: *Areas of Projections of Analytic Sets.* Invent. math., **16**, 335-341, (1972).

[**Ba**] Barlet D.: *Majoration du volume des finres génériques et la forme géomètrique du théorème d'aplatissement.* Semiar P. Lelong - H. Skoda, Lect. Notes Math., **822**, 1-17, (1978/79).

[**B-T**] Bedford E., Taylor B.: *A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions.* Acta Math. (1982) **149**, 1-40, (1982).

[**B-M**] Bierstone, E., Milman, P.D.: *Local resolution of singularities.* Proc. Symp. Pure. Math. **52**, 42-64, (1991).

[**Gl**] Golysin G.: *Geometric function theory.* Nauka, Moscow (1966).

[**H-S**] Harvey R., Shiffman B.: *A characterization of holomorphic chains .* Ann. Math. **99**, 553-587, (1974).

[**Hi**] Hironaka H.: *Introduction to the theory of infinitely near singular points.* Mem. Mat. Inst. Jorge Juan, **28**, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Madrid (1974).

[**Hs**] Hirschowitz A.: *Les deux types de méromorphie différent.* J. reine & ang. Math., **313** , 157 - 160, (1980).

[**F**] Frisch J. *Points de platitude d'une morphisme d'espaces analytiques complexes.* Invent. math. **4** , 118 - 138, (1967).

[**Iv-1**] Ivashkovich S.: *The Hartogs phenomenon for holomorphically convex Kähler manifolds* Math. USSR Izvestiya **29** N 1, 225-232 (1987).

[**Iv-2**] Ivashkovich S.: *The Hartogs-type extension theorem for the meromorphic maps into compact Kähler manifolds.* Invent. math. **109** , 47-54, (1992).

[**Ka-1**] Kato, M.: *Compact complex manifolds containing "global spherical shells".* Proc. Int. Symp. Alg. Geom. Kyoto. 45-84, (1977).

[**Ka-2**] Kato, M.: *Examples on an Extension Problem of Holomorphic Maps and Holomorphic 1-Dimensional Foliations.* Tokyo Journal Math. **13**, n 1, 139-146, (1990).

[**Kz**] Kazaryan M.: *Meromorphic extension with respect to grouops of variables.* Math. USSR Sbornik **53**, n 2, 385-398, (1986).

[**Kl**] Klimek M.: *Pluripozential theory.* London. Math. Soc. Monographs , New Series 6, (1991).

[**Os**] Osgood W.: *Lehrbuch der Funktionstheorie, Bd.II.1.* Leipzig. Teubner (1929).

[**Re**] Remmert R.: *Holomorphe und meromorphe Abbildungen komplexer Räume.* Math. Ann. **133**, 328-370, (1957).

[**Sa**] Sadullaev A.: *Plurisubharmonic measures and capacities on complex manifolds.* Russian Math. Surv. **36**, No 4 , 61-119, (1981).

[**Sh-1**] Shiffman B.: *Extension of Holomorphic Maps into Hermitian Manifolds.* Math. Ann. **194**, 249-258, (1971).

[**Sh-2**] Shiffman B.: *Separately meromorphic mappings into compact Kähler manifolds.* Contributions to Complex Analysis and Analytic Geometry (H. Skoda and J.-M.Trépreau, eds) Vieweg, Braunschweig, Germany, 243-250 (1994).

[**Sh-3**] Shiffman B.: *Hartogs theorems for separately holomorphic mappings into complex spaces.* C.R.Acad.Sci. Paris, t.310, Série I, 89-84, (1990).

[**Si-1**] Siu Y.-T.: *Every stein subvariety admits a stein neighborhood.* Invent. Math. **38**, N 1, 89-100, (1976).

[**St**] Stolzenberg G.: *Volumes, Limits and Extension of Analytic Varieties.* Springer Verlag (1966).

Université de Lille-I
UFR Mathématiques
59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex
France

ivachkov@gat.univ-lille1.fr

IAPMM Acad Sci. of Ukraine
Naukova 3/b, 290053 Lviv
Ukraine